




D
NAVAL
MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA 93943

SEBASTIAN
GRADUATE SCHOOL

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Monterey, California



THESIS

EGYPT BETWEEN THE SUPERPOWERS:
CONTINUITY OR CHANGE IN
EGYPTIAN FOREIGN POLICY UNDER MUBARAK

by

Mohamed Youssef Amer

December 1984

Thesis Advisor:

John W. Amos, II

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

T221689

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Egypt Between the Superpowers: Continuity or Change in Egyptian Foreign Policy under Mubarak		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Master's Thesis; December 1984
7. AUTHOR(s) Mohamed Youssef Amer		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE December 1984
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 131
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Egypt, Mubarak, Sadat, Egyptian Foreign Policy, Egypt and the United States, Egypt and the Soviet Union, Egypt and the Superpowers, Middle East politics, Egypt and the Arab World.		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This thesis deals with Egyptian foreign policy under President Mohamed Hosni Mubarak. The emphasis is on Egypt's orientation between the superpowers, and the dilemma of continui- ty or change. The Egyptian leadership's perception of their country's international and regional role will also be discussed as it affects the foreign policy decision-making process. We propose that a reassessment by the Mubarak regime was made re- garding Egypt's foreign policy in the wake of Sadat's		

Block 20. Abstract (cont'd)

assassination with the desire to break out of its isolation. Mubarak is presenting a variation of Sadat's solution on how to balance an active foreign policy with limited resources and serious economic problems without becoming overly dependent on either superpower. Our hypothesis is that Egyptian foreign policy has not deviated markedly in content since Sadat, however it has in style. Egypt continues to maintain a special relationship with the United States, despite the recent exchange of ambassadors with the Soviet Union and its reassertion of the nonaligned principles as a guide to its foreign policy.

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

Egypt Between the Superpowers: Continuity or Change
in Egyptian Foreign Policy under Mubarak

by

Mohamed Youssef Amer
Lieutenant, United States Navy
B.A., University of Minnesota, 1974

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
December 1984

ABSTRACT

This thesis deals with Egyptian foreign policy under President Mohamed Hosni Mubarak. The emphasis is on Egypt's orientation between the superpowers, and the dilemma of continuity or change. The Egyptian leadership's perception of their country's international and regional role is discussed as it affects the foreign policy decision-making process. We propose that a reassessment by the Mubarak regime was made regarding Egypt's foreign policy in the wake of Sadat's assassination with the desire to break out of its isolation. Mubarak is presenting a variation of Sadat's solution on how to balance an active foreign policy with limited resources and serious economic problems without becoming overly dependent on either superpower. Our hypothesis is that Egyptian foreign policy has not deviated markedly in content since Sadat, however it has in style. Egypt continues to maintain a special relationship with the United States, despite the recent exchange of ambassadors with the Soviet Union and its reassertion of the nonaligned principles as a guide to its foreign policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA 93943

I.	INTRODUCTION-----	
II.	A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS-----	10
III.	ROLE CONCEPTION-----	16
IV.	POLITICO-DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES-----	31
V.	POLITICO-DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION AND THE NONALIGNED MOVEMENT-----	55
	A. USSR-----	55
	B. NONALIGNED MOVEMENT-----	68
VI.	MILITARY RELATIONS-----	77
	A. FACILITIES-----	86
	B. JOINT EXERCISES-----	92
VII.	ECONOMIC AND TRADE RELATIONS-----	97
VIII.	CONCLUSIONS-----	112
	LIST OF REFERENCES-----	119
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST-----	130

I. INTRODUCTION

A little over three years have now passed since President Mubarak of Egypt had assumed power. His predecessor, the late President Sadat, had forged a close relationship with the United States shifting Egypt's superpower orientation from the east to the west. We shall examine whether Mubarak has maintained Sadat's foreign policy objectives and the means to achieve them or not. There has been much said in Moscow, Washington, and other capitals about Mubarak being a Sadat clone, or a Nasser-type. Some have said Egypt has turned 180-degrees under Mubarak, while others called him a traitor to the Arab cause. Even the average Egyptian on the streets of Cairo cannot tell you if Mubarak has changed or continued his predecessors foreign policy. Like the rest of the world, many Egyptians fall back on recent history and the two previous presidents -- Nasser and Sadat. Mubarak is compared with the two late leaders and understandably one cannot neatly categorize him. Again, recent Egyptian history gave the world charismatic leaders; while the international setting provided each leader with a chance to literally perform miracles on the world stage.

It is important to keep in mind when reading this study, that it was designed to reflect the views of a Third World

state as it probes its environment, wishing to control and manipulate as many of the variables as possible which impact on the formulation of its foreign policy. To maximize influence while minimizing the cost or effort. The need to understand at least how some of these key Third World countries formulate their external behavior in the world does exist. The types of pressures on the Egyptian leadership differ greatly from those affecting Washington or Paris. Overpopulation, limited resources, a significant illiteracy rate, and deeply-rooted religious consciousness combined with a strategic location complicate the delicate balance needed to survive by any Egyptian regime in the volatile Middle East. At times the leadership becomes caught in its own vituperation with subsequent catastrophic results or it realizes the state's inherent dependence on external resources to perform its perceived role and becomes disillusioned. As we explore the question of continuity or change we will also need to look at these contradictory pressures on the Egyptian leadership.

We will attempt to remove the confusion that has been circulating for a period now, and answer the question of continuity or change. This study will be divided into several parts. Chapter 2 will cover the framework for analysis used in the study. "Role conception" -- the regime's strategy, general orientation and perceptions of reality, will be introduced in Chapter 3 and brought in at various parts

when necessary. In Chapter 4 we will cover Egyptian politico-diplomatic relations with the United States, the Soviet Union, and the nonaligned world. Egyptian military and economic relations will involve Chapters 6 and 7. Therefore, "role enactment" of the current regime will be discussed in Chapters 4-7. Each of these chapters will not be mutually exclusive. The issues of the day cut across the above artificial divisions. These were only designed as an analytical tool to better study the data and events.

There will not be any elaborate presentation of Egypt's economy, history, or its social make-up. These have been well covered elsewhere and would be repetitive in nature.* Relevant issues from these subjects will be brought forward in as far as they impact on this study. In the conclusion we will tie together the elements presented in the body. We will engage ourselves in the luxury of offering probable courses of actions by the current Egyptian regime in light of the results of our study.

Sources used were predominantly in Arabic, mostly but not all were Egyptian sources. These included books, newspaper and magazine accounts of interviews with key decision-makers. In addition the author was afforded the opportunity

*See Waterbury, J., The Egypt of Nasser and Sadat, Princeton University Press, 1983; Aliboni, R., and others, Egypt's Economic Potential, Croom Helm, 1984; and, Ajami, F., The Arab Predicament, pp. 77-136, Cambridge University Press, 1981.

to conduct in-country research at Al-Ahram Center of Strategic Studies and was grateful for discussing some of his ideas with academics, political appointees, and members of the Egyptian elite.

II. A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS

The Third World has presented a challenge to those analyzing the foreign policies of its developing states [Ref. 1]. Three major approaches had dominated the study of foreign policy:

- (1) Relating a country's foreign policy to the personality of a single leader. This approach advocated the study of the kings and presidents to understand the source of foreign policy. The leader's whims decide the fate of the state.
- (2) The "grand theory" or the great powers approach as advocated by Morgenthau in his classic treatise Politics Among Nations. This approach views foreign policy as a function of east-west conflict. The developing countries lack autonomy in foreign policy formulation. They are always reacting to external situations not of their own doing.
- (3) The Reductionist or model-building approach [Ref. 2] does not differentiate between developed and developing countries regarding their foreign policy process. Some underlying assumptions include that the behavior of all actors follows a rational actor model of decision-making, that they are powerenhancers, and are motivated by security factors.

While the above approaches have some utility value in the developing world, they have not been without some serious drawbacks. The main weaknesses of the first two approaches is their neglect of the domestic context in decision-making. The psychologistic approach totally neglects context, while rendering foreign policy to an erratic, and irrational activity. The great powers approach effectively negates any developing nation the ability of an independent foreign policy.

The third approach has more explanatory power but does not account for specific features sui generis such as modernization, low level or inexistent institutionalization and dependency status in the global stratification system.

A new body of literature emerged in the 1970s with emphasis on domestic sources of foreign policy and linking modernization and social change to the nation's foreign policy. Additional emphasis was also placed on the actor's economic position in the global hierarchy. Dessouki and Korany label this new body of literature "the foreign policy of development" [Ref. 3:p. 7]. They suggest that a proper analysis of the foreign policies of Third World countries "Cannot be separated from the domestic social structure or domestic political process...we have to open the 'black box'." And regarding the global environment "...a Third World society can be permeated, penetrated, and even dominated. It is thus important to see how external constraints and global structures...affect its foreign policy-making process as well as its international behavior." [Ref. 3:p. 8]

Dessouki and Korany advance three major issues faced by developing countries in the conduct of their foreign policies [Ref. 3:p. 8]. The first is the aid/independence dilemma where the trade-off is between the need for foreign aid and the maintenance of national independence.

The second issue is the resources/objectives dilemma. This is a problem when the developing country formulates

diplomatic and military objectives clearly beyond its indigenous resource base. A country's activist policies and "historical" legacy can quickly exhaust its resources and capabilities.

The third issue advanced is the security/development dilemma -- the guns or butter debate. Sadat's overtures to the United States were at least partly motivated by his country's economic woes. While Syria today is neglecting development vis-a-vis its obvious security needs.

These dilemmas or issue areas have to be tackled by the Egyptian regime under Mubarak, just as Sadat had done for over a decade. But has Mubarak's choices deviated from his predecessors? If so, why? Do they both conceptualize reality in similar terms? Has their personalities effected the decision-making process? Also, has there been any objective changes to the environment (domestic, regional, and global) within which major decisions were made?

The conceptual framework of this study will revolve around Egypt's foreign policy outputs using the concepts of general orientation and national role-conception [Ref. 4]. K. J. Holsti defines orientation as "...a state's general attitudes and commitments toward the external environment and its fundamental strategy for accomplishing its domestic and external objectives and for coping with persisting threats." [Ref. 4: p. 98] Moving from the broad and general concept of orientation we then deal with the national

role-conception which Holsti defines as "...the policy maker's definitions of the general kinds of decisions, commitments, rules, and actions suitable to their state and of the functions their state should perform in a variety of geographic and issue settings." [Ref. 4:p. 116] Dessouki and Korany have combined both general orientation and national role to a category of "role conception", while categorizing "role performance" or "role enactment" to the specific foreign policy behavior [Ref. 3:p. 12]. Therefore, foreign policy output is disaggregated to its relevant components, the "say" and "do" of the government.

In this study we will attempt then to establish Egypt's foreign policy orientation, general objectives and strategy -- "role conception." This will be basically achieved by looking at the public declarations of Egypt's leaders, past and present, in addition to key officials involved in the foreign policy decision-making process. These could be in forms of published works, speeches, interviews, or joint statements with foreign dignitaries. We will observe that some of the elements making up the "role conception" have been constant with the variation being each regime's perceptions of its environment, and the ways to deal with it. We should then not be too surprised if "role conception" in Egypt has been more constant than not in recent history.

Regarding specific foreign policy behavior or "role enactment" we will be examining the "do's" of the present

leadership. How did they act on political, military and economic issues which provide them the opportunity to exercise their "role conception." Are they saying one thing and doing another? If so, then why? Was there a gap in Sadat's Egypt between the "say" and "do" of his regime? Again we need to compare Mubarak's actions with his predecessor in relation to their "role conception" and the context of their decisions if we expect to answer the continuity or change question.

Once that is answered, we need to ask ourselves why? What causes one leader to deviate or continue on prior policies. Obviously, perceptions may change by the change of leadership but their external expression will remain constrained by environmental structures unless an effort is made to change them. The domestic context in Egypt has played an important role as a constraint on available presidential choices on foreign policy. The economic dilemma passed to Mubarak still exists as it had under Sadat. The population continues to increase, but local agricultural production is not maintaining pace. So to complete the analytical picture we must look inside the 'black box', to look at the domestic environment providing the immediate and most vital decisional context.* But we should not downplay the importance of

*Any regime must first survive in order to carry out its policies. It does the leader no good to make decisions favorable to international organizations if they may cause his demise at home.

existing systemic structures which interact with national capabilities and dispositions to determine the direction and scope of a country's foreign policy.

III. ROLE CONCEPTION

"The pages of history are full of heroes who created for themselves roles of glorious valor which they played at decisive moments. Likewise the pages of history are also full of heroic and glorious roles which never found heroes to perform them. For some reason it seems to me that within the Arab circle there is a role, wandering aimlessly in search of a hero...[it] has at last settled down...near the borders of our country and is beckoning to us to move, to take up its lines, to put on its costume, since no one else is qualified to play it." [Ref. 1]

"Egypt, for several centuries, has been performing an important function of cultural and political synthesis between Islam and Christianity, the Arab world and Europe, Africa and Asia, and civilization of the desert and that of the Mediterranean. This reality, together with the perennial character of the citizens of the oldest state in the area, acquired through the ages, constitutes an important factor that conditions the attitudes and behavior of Egypt toward the rest of the world." [Ref. 2]

Egypt's geography places it astride two continents, linking the Arab east (Machreq) and the Arab west (Maghreb), Asia and Africa. It is part and parcel of the African continent, the Moslem world, the developing Third World, and the Mediterranean world. It was ruled by Persians, Romans, Turks, and Arabs for milleniums. They all left their imprint on the Egyptian culture with the Arab-Islamic heritage dominating since the seventh century.

The Nile river is another constant in Egypt's geography, for thousands of years it has linked Egypt with the heart of Africa. Mohamed Ali's sons, Ismail Pasha and Ibrahim Pasha, retraced the steps of the Pharaoes and between 1822 and 1840 were able to bring all Sudanese provinces under Egyptian

control. Unification of the Nile valley under Egyptian rule was deemed necessary for security and economic reasons. Today this continues with emphasis on unification and less on rule by the Egyptian leadership. Heikal [Ref. 3], once considered the most influential journalist in the Middle East, in a 1978 article evaluates Egyptian vitality by the direction of its foreign policy, whether its dealing on its eastern flank or its southern border: "The more outgoing and vigorous it is, the more active its policy toward the east; the more introspective and turned in on itself it becomes, the more it looks southward." [Ref. 3: p. 717] He additionally delineates a struggle between the "Middle Eastern system" advocated by the West to counter the threat of communism and the "Arab system" advocated by Nasser and Arab nationalists who did not see their region as an extension of the struggle in Europe between the superpowers.

These geographical, cultural, and historical constants play a major role in shaping the options available to any Egyptian ruler and go beyond any personal idiosyncratic approach in explaining Egypt's orientation. As Boutros-Ghali wrote in 1963:

"the unique geopolitical position of the U.A.R....imposes on her a dynamic foreign policy which compels her to squarely meet a new challenge: how to discharge today the obligations of her unique geopolitical and historical position with the power and means at her disposal." [Ref. 4]

Nasser, inaugurated in 1955 the concept of the three circles (Arab, African, and Islamic) in which he envisioned Egypt providing the leadership role. To that was added the

circle of nonalignment or neutralist policy crystallizing after the Bandung and Brioni conferences of 1955-56. Non-alignment became a major foundation in Egyptian foreign policy:

".... Neutralism has emerged as a new ideology...in the field of foreign relations, [it] is incompatible with any pro-Western Mediterranean policy...likewise it is incompatible with any particular designs that the Soviet Union might have on the Middle East." [Ref. 4:p. 347]

Egypt's leadership role in the region was crystallizing from the mid-1940s onwards following its relative isolation from its eastern neighbors earlier in the century. Nasser in order to maximize Egypt's prestige and influence in the region and the world sought to remove Egypt and the Arab world from the spheres of influence of the superpowers, and attempted to develop cooperation in the region to increase its self-worth [Ref. 5]. By so doing he would render Egypt the dominant power in the Arab world and to bring some semblance of dignity following the 1948 Arab defeat at the hands of Israel. Boutros-Ghali writing over twenty years ago on Egypt's foreign policy orientation, states that in:

"...the African, the Arabic, the Muslim, and the neutralist [circles] -- Egypt may hope to enjoy a role of leadership. On the contrary, in any pro-Western policy, Egypt always played the role of a vassal state." [Ref. 4:p. 334]

This basic orientation of Egyptian foreign policy has conferred many bonuses on the country but not without some problems. One needs only to remember John Foster Dulles and his depiction of nonalignment and neutralist policies

"immoral" as he strove to develop an anti-communist Middle East/Northern Tier bloc. K. J. Holsti describes nonalignment orientation,

"...as a means of obtaining maximum economic concessions from both blocs, recognizing that to make permanent military arrangements with one bloc would close off the other as a possible source of supply, markets, and foreign aid.... To be nonaligned is to maximize opportunities to meet domestic economic needs, while minimizing dependencies."
[Ref. 6]

This policy has additional attraction since it has often been couched in anti-Western terms reflecting the abundant anti-colonial feelings in the 1950s and 1960s. An easy means to gain political domestic support would be to pronounce neutralist policies and denounce Western imperialism.

The end of the tumultuous decade of the 1960s brought a new breed of leaders in an altered environment. The days of the Nassers, Nehrus, Sukarnos, and Nkrumahs were coming to a close as was the wave of entries of newly independent states. Economic development and modernization became the occupation of these new governments. Now that many had celebrated their independence and undergone the agonies of consolidating their power over, more often than not, a diverse ethnic peoples within arbitrary political borders, they looked at economic -- and more precisely industrial -- development as the fruit and symbol of independence. Egypt's historical past and experience [Ref. 7] had been different and was spared many of the social agonies of newly emerging states. However, the desire to gain independence from its colonial power had been the thread of similarity with other African states.

Anwar El-Sadat in October 1970 was elected president of Egypt following Nasser's death. He was facing mounting economic problems, a military stalemate with Israel over Sinai since 1967, in conjunction with a general lack of popular confidence in the government and the military.* Sadat reiterated his predecessor's legacy "Freedom, Socialism, and Unity," for he was in Nasser's shadows. His legitimacy was tied directly to Nasser and the July Revolution. He had been a member of the Free Officers involved in the 1952 coup, and had survived all the internal jockeying for power within Nasser's circle to find himself the Vice-president at the time of Nasser's death.

The year 1971 was momentous for Sadat [Ref. 8]. He had dubbed it the "Year of decision" with regards to liberating the Sinai. It also witnessed his consolidation of power over the Ali Sabri group in May. This was subsequently called the "Second Revolution" or more popularly "The Corrective Revolution." Interestingly, the dean of Egyptian letters Tawfig Al-Hakim [Ref. 9] in a book published in 1974 but written in 1972 -- before the October War, he attacks the Nasser years. The whole Nasser experience becomes a moment of madness where empty victories were sought and pan-Arab dreams remain just that -- costly dreams, argues Tawfig Al-Hakim.

*The eminent Egyptian writer Naguib Mahfouz reflects the mood of the country between 1967-1973 in the novels: Al-Maraya, Cairo, 1972; Al-Hub Taht Al-Matar, Cairo, 1973; and Al-Karnak, Cairo, 1974.

The October War gave Sadat the opportunity to right a wrong (the 1967 defeat), regain Egyptian dignity, and vastly increase the scope of his political and diplomatic maneuverability. This limited victory would enable him to embark on his own initiatives -- domestically and regionally without being overly concerned with his predecessor's legacy. He was now willing to and capable of making the difficult decisions which may go against established Arab and Egyptian political tradition and norms. In the spring of 1974, he embarked on the open door policy -- opening Egypt economically to western technology, Arab capital -- to tap Egypt's abundant resources [Ref. 10]. By a single stroke, Sadat hoped to remove the Arab socialism of Nasser and introduce his economic liberalization policy designed to lift Egypt from its economic quagmire. His assessment of the present international economic system and local economic conditions on the one hand and Egypt's attempts and failures since 1952 to attract capital (Egyptian and otherwise) brought him to the aforementioned policy decision.

In conjunction with domestic economic reforms, Sadat was preparing to align himself* with the United States, while increasing his distance from the Soviet Union whom he later described as "crude and tasteless people." [Ref. 11] Ali E.

*For Sadat there was no difference between himself and the State, they are one and the same. The army was 'My' army, 'My' sons and daughters were the Egyptian youth.

Hillal Dessouki [Ref. 12], a well respected academic at Cairo University presents Sadat's foreign policy objectives to include:

- (1) The termination of the war with Israel, as the economic costs had become unbearable.
- (2) The improvement of relations with Washington, as the United States was the only country that could influence Israel.
- (3) The rejuvenation and modernization of the economy through the import of modern western technology and private capital.
- (4) The modification of Egypt's global and regional policies in order to better pursue these objectives.

Sadat's Egypt would lead the Arab world just at Nasser's Egypt had but this time toward peace and prosperity for all; or so Sadat had hoped. Both men believed that Egypt's greatness was due to its Arab affiliation combined with a regionally active foreign policy [Ref. 13], while Sadat saw it as "a structural property, not a behavioral attribute, as a property that could not be challenged or taken away. Consequently, he did not feel the need to pursue an activist Arab policy to maintain this leadership." [Ref. 12: p. 130]

Dessouki's criticism of Sadat maybe a bit harsh since Sadat truly believed that he can achieve with peace a comprehensive solution to the Palestinian problem at Egypt's help and with American participation. Egypt would continue its political leadership and would demonstrate to the nouveau-riches of the Peninsula that petro-dollars are not sufficient to de-throne Egypt.

Regarding Egypt's role in the region, Sadat in 1975

assures us:

"This is Egypt's fate, since time immemorial she has been and continues to be the greatest Arab country, the most influential and active in the region due to her heritage, culture, and geo-strategic location...did you not see how when Egypt's army emerged victorious in Sinai in October that all the Arabs felt it was their victory."
[Ref. 14]

Three years later at a conference of the American Universities in Cairo, he reiterated:

"Egypt has had an historical role in the region and the Arab world for seven thousand years and Egypt has carried out her leadership role with mastery. Most of the Arab states remain small but Egypt is the oldest nation in the world...and in the 19th century our communication with Europe began before the establishment of most of the local states...and for these political, geo-political, historical, and geographical reasons Egypt has a specific role in the region, and of course all have acknowledged it." [Ref. 15]

During Sadat's historic trip to Jerusalem in 1977 he was interviewed by Barbara Walters and in reply to a question on Egypt's leadership role in the Arab World, he said "This is a fact. War or peace is decided in Egypt, because as I told you, we are forty million." [Ref. 16] On another occasion Sadat expressed his belief that the Arab world would fall in line behind Egypt. This was reflected in a reply to a question by then Israel's minister of defense Ezer Weizman: "The Jordanians will follow in our footsteps. So will the Syrians. Things in the Arab world happen the way Egypt decides." [Ref. 17]

To Egypt's west, Qadhafi continued to urge unity with Egypt. His near fanatical desire to unite the two countries

stem not only from his ideological commitment to Arab unity, but also from his belief that Egypt's capabilities will give him claim to leadership of the Arab world. This would explain his often quoted assertion that whereas he was a leader without a country, Egypt was a country without a leader [Ref. 18]. Both countries were briefly involved in a border clash in July, 1977, following four years of exceedingly deteriorating conditions.

Libya was then armed by the Soviets who have since embarked on providing Qadhafi with modern and sophisticated weaponry in quantities beyond his country's absorption capacity. The threats to destabilize Egypt's ally, Mideiri of Sudan by Ethiopia and Libya were also viewed in Egypt as Soviet machinations to encircle Egypt. With Sadat's Jerusalem trip, the subsequent Camp David Accords and the Peace Treaty with Israel, Sadat saw the Soviet's hand in the growing regional and international opposition to Egypt. He tried to improve his position with the United States while casting doubt on the "peaceful intentions" of the Soviet Union. His anti-Soviet rhetoric grew and in September 1981 he expelled the Soviet ambassador from Cairo due to alleged interference in Egypt's internal affairs, and generating sectarian sedition [Ref. 19]. Accompanying these decisions were over 1,500 arrests made in September leading to the tragic events of 6 October 1981 [Ref. 20].

To summarize Egypt's orientation or role conception as perceived by Sadat up to this point, we would first emphasize Egypt's centrality in the Arab world. Although that leadership was cracked in 1967, and briefly regained in 1973 only to pass to the Arabian Peninsula, the Egyptian elite and Sadat see the constants of history and geography will give Egypt back its natural role. In a book on Egypt and the Arab League, Abdel Hamid Al-Muwafi [Ref. 21] writes "...and any of these other [Arab] states...do not even have the strength of a leading geographic position as does Egypt, so how then will they compete for a leadership which they do not qualify." And he later goes on to refute those advancing Saudi Arabia the leadership role due to its oil revenue:

"...she is not capable of marshalling an effective military force which may be needed to support the leadership role; in addition, the extreme political conservatism of the regime coupled with the influential American interests within the regime add resistance to her carrying out a leadership role."

Al-Muwafi sees Egypt's currently diminished status as ephemeral:

"...because the economic problem which is the current element of weakness in Egypt, is much easier to overcome than the other weaknesses facing those other countries hoping to participate with Egypt in performing the leadership role."

Secondly, Sadat ushered in the peace era a la Washington with the political October War. He saw the futility of defeating Israel militarily as long as the United States was fully backing it. With that strategy in mind, the U.S. was the superpower to court in order to achieve a just and equitable comprehensive peace in the region. The eventual reality

of Egypt's separate peace and the ostracization of Egypt by the Arab world could be reduced at the economic level by American aid, Sadat reasoned.* However, the cultural and psychological impact on the population could not be dealt with using the new American connection. What's worse, is Sadat's increasing to near total dependency on the U.S. due to a growing domestic disillusion with his internal policies, combined with the strains in his relations with the socialist countries. This illicited memories of the post 1967 period when Nasser had become totally dependent on the Soviets. Neither situation was healthy, reasoned many Egyptian intellectuals [Ref. 13:p. 34].

Thirdly, the Soviet Union became the "root of all evil" [Ref. 22] in Sadat's parlance. One may question how much of that reflected true Egyptian feeling and how much was to bring Egyptian and U.S. interest closer together. However, it is felt that the perception of a Soviet threat or of its clients encircling Egypt, was and is still real in the mind of the political and military leadership [Ref. 22]. This is not to say they expect Soviet forces to invade Egypt but that countries opposed to Egypt and her policies will use Soviet weapons and influence to politically destabilize Egypt or a

*Sadat never imagined that the Arab reaction would reach the level of hostility that it did due to his initiatives, for he initially believed that he and President Carter would deliver the promised comprehensive peace and bring prosperity and stability to Egypt and the region.

neighboring pro-Egyptian regime on the one hand or an actual military confrontation with a Soviet supported regime on the other.

Fourthly, Sadat and the Egyptian leadership within the peace-era framework hoped to have the U.S. recognize the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and for the PLO to recognize Israel's right to exist [Ref. 23]. They believed that stability, which Egypt dearly needs to support economic growth and foreign investment, could not be reached without solving the crux of the Arab-Israeli problem: the Palestinian question. Until this is solved, Egypt would remain on the political periphery of the Arab world, unable to exercise its 'natural' leadership role. Its relations with the U.S., on whom it relies heavily, would continue to levy a high cost so long as the U.S. continues to pursue policies that are unpopular in the region.

Finally, Egypt's nonalignment credentials were increasingly coming under fire in the late 1970s as a direct result of its close ties with the U.S. and the peace treaty with Israel. At the sixth Nonaligned Conference of 1979 held in Havana, there was an unsuccessful move to expel Egypt from the movement. However, Egypt's position had weakened so much in the 1970s within the nonaligned movement that a Jeune Afrique [Ref. 24] correspondent queried Boutros-Ghali if Mubarak was rejoining the movement, "we have never stopped being a full member of it" was the minister's reply. Moreover, "Egypt has

always played a major role in nonalignment. The Camp David agreements concealed that role somewhat...." added Boutros-Ghali. A few weeks before Sadat's assassination, on the 20th anniversary of the first nonaligned Summit, the Egyptian minister affirmed his country's responsibility for preserving the nonaligned movement and to defend and protect its principles from deviation [Ref. 25].

From this we can see that Egypt's diminished role in the nonaligned movement was due to Sadat's* strategy of regaining the Sinai and finding a solution equitable to the Palestinians within an American framework. This framework was more appealing to Sadat since it would serve to tie Egypt and the United States in the peace process, and Israel had historically been more amenable to bilateral talks instead of international forums. In addition, the nonaligned movement had deviated from its founding principles and was advocating a "natural alliance" with the countries of the socialist camp. The movement was losing influence internationally and had come under doubt in the U.S. A simple cost/benefit analysis by Sadat indicated to him that efforts spent on the movement would prove futile and that he ought to concentrate on weaning the

*At the institutional level there does not seem to have been as great a reduction in emphasis on nonalignment in foreign policy formulation. However, this was overshadowed by Sadat's preferences. See discussion with Boutros-Ghali in Al-Siyasah Al-Duwaliyah, pp. 157-164, v. 17 (65), July 1981; also Foreign minister Kamal Hassan Ali's remarks on Africa and nonalignment in his 28 September speech to the NDP.

U.S. from Israel and make Egypt the linchpin of any American strategy in the Middle East [Ref. 26].

The United States witnessed in a year's time deterioration in its strategic position in the region. The fall of the Shah of Iran, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and the seizure of the Grand Mosque in Mecca were rather ominous. Sadat analyzed the situation through Washingtonian spectacles and began to play the Egyptian card which must have looked very appealing by the end of 1979 to the American strategists.

Hosni Mubarak was fortunate in October 1981 to have been Sadat's Vice-president since April of 1975. He had a lot of time to learn and appreciate the nuances of running a government in the strategic Middle East. When asked which was more difficult, his responsibility when he was head of the Air Force or as the president he did not hesitate to say the latter, in a way almost wishing he was still in the military. "The most burdensome thing that can happen to you in a developing country is that you get to be the president...the military with all its responsibilities is in actuality more pleasurable. There is no comparison." [Ref. 27] The 1981 change of leadership may be of little consequence regarding any structural changes in Egyptian foreign policy especially since "...the foreign policy of a country is the sum of various geopolitical, historical and economic components." [Ref. 26] Egypt's goals and objectives will remain the same, only the means might differ; emphasizing one aspect while relegating another, it is a period of reassessment and not

wholesale changes. The Mubarak regime has survived the initial traumatic initiation on Egypt's throne, and had had three years to smooth out all the bumps and develop the outlines for future policies. It will be our task in the next section to examine the "role enactment", the actions of the regime and how it relates to its "role conception".

IV. POLITICO-DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

In the next two chapters we will examine Egyptian relation with the United States, the Soviet Union, and the Non-aligned nations. Government and opposition views will be presented as each group attempts to influence or carry out a coherent foreign policy strategy.

On 14 October 1981, Mubarak was sworn in as President of the Arab Republic of Egypt. He represented a change from his predecessors, Nasser and Sadat. They were members of the Free Officers of the 1952 Revolution. They had ended the rule of the Mohamed Ali dynasty and returned the country to Egyptian rule after an absence of over two millennia. Mubarak was a new breed, he was a leader in the victorious October War generation [Ref. 1]. Sadat made the break with the July Revolution by his choice for the Vice-presidency and his already started de-Nasserization program [Ref. 2].

The relation between the United States and Egypt in the post-Sadat period had been marked with a seeming increase in distance from that during Sadat's second term (1977-1981). Mubarak is acting more independently from the U.S. and is applying nonaligned language in his international behavior. He is slowly but surely returning Egypt to the Arab fold and had placed the normalization process with Israel in cold storage. Moreover, the new Soviet ambassador to Cairo,

Alexander Bolotogov, presented his credentials to Mubarak on 24 September 1984, thereby returning diplomatic representation to the ambassadorial level after a three year break.

Has Mubarak really taken Egypt out of the tight American orbit that it had found itself in at the close of the Sadat era? Or is it simple the difference in style between the two men? Most observers would agree that there has been a style change. However, regarding the content of his foreign policy, views differ and depend greatly on the analyst's political and ideological leanings and your geographical location. Some in Washington have allegedly complained that Egypt under Mubarak has changed "180-degrees", while other see Mubarak's policies as a continuation of his predecessor, "...Mubarak is a very clever Sadat in disguise." [Ref. 3]

A leading academic at the American University in Cairo, Saad Eddin Ibrahim, wrote an article a year after Sadat's assassination entitled "The Fight over Mubarak's Soul." He takes on the continuity or change dilemma facing Mubarak and suggests that change is imperative, "There will be a change. The question is really how much change, in what direction, and when will it take place." He says that if Mubarak adheres to the spirit and form of Sadat's major policies, there will be continuity without much legitimacy; "The consensus of all observers...is that Mubarak cannot afford to carry on Egypt's politics as usual." [Ref. 4]

Let us attempt in the coming pages to draw the outlines of Mubarak's foreign policy as it concerns Egypt's American connection. First of all Mubarak needed in October of 1981 to present a picture of stability and continuity in the political process [Ref. 5] in order to save the country from internal havoc and to secure international opinion and trust in Egypt and his regime. Considering the assassination and its potential fallout, the power transition was very smooth and successful -- it was uneventful. This was a remarkable achievement by any Third World standard.

A week after his inauguration, Mubarak commenting on U.S. relations said, "We look forward to have very good relations with the United States, like any other country, the other European countries. The United States is helping us in many fields -- in the economic and military fields." Mubarak described any improvement in Egyptian-Arab relations positively, "...It is in the interest of the United States that there be stability and good relations with the Arabs." With regards to the Soviet Union he explained that Egypt is not against the establishment of good relations with any state in the whole world. It will not accept at all any state interfering in its internal affairs, and that relations will be established with all states but on equal basis. He added "...I hope you will not get the impression that I intend to start any negotiations with the Soviets at present." [Ref. 6]

Dr. Boutros-Ghali, Egypt's Minister of State for foreign affairs, is a well respected academic and public servant whose family has long been involved in Egyptian politics. He is currently the longest serving member on Mubarak's cabinet. He also has ties with Al-Ahram and has been director of its center for political and strategic studies and editor of its Arabic quarterly, International Politics. He is heavily involved in the design of Egypt's nonalignment and African policies and has represented Mubarak and Sadat before him in official capacities. During the Nasser years he was an ardent pan-Arabist who believed in Egypt's centrality in the region and its potential leading role in the Third World and the non-aligned nations. One cannot say that he changed his beliefs during the Sadat era but only that they did not find expression. He represents the preponderant view of those career officers at the foreign ministry.

A few days after Mubarak's assumption of power, Ghali stated that Egypt, as a state, is interested in maintaining good relations with the world's great powers. He added that Egypt's relations with the United States must be viewed in light of the fact that Egypt has no desire to play the role of policeman in the area for anybody, "We are a nonaligned state and our special relationship with the United States cannot possible influence our nonalignment." [Ref. 7] A day later in a London interview, Ghali affirmed the goal of peace in the Middle East:

"...The goal of Egyptian policy is still to achieve an overall, just and durable peace in the Middle East...Egypt welcomes any new initiative whether made by countries or international organizations with regard to the Middle East."
[Ref. 8]

He added that Egypt's diplomacy does not adhere to any specific methods to achieve this goal, because the goal itself is what counts.

Similar remarks were made during the Sadat era, however they were not implemented, they reflected a consensus of views at the ministerial levels which became empty rhetoric by Sadat's actions. There was a gap between some elements of the "orientation" and "enactment" during the latter part of Sadat's regime, specifically in the nonalignment sphere. This had become a linchpin of Egyptian foreign policy under Nasser and some would argue that it had an even earlier start [Ref. 9]. The notion of nonalignment and positive neutralism had been firmly implanted in the minds of the Egyptian elite.* There was great relief by most if not all Egyptians when Sadat expelled the Soviets in July of 1972. Even though the official government sponsored media had not attacked or questioned Egypt's nonaligned credentials during the 1967-1972 years when it was evident that Egypt increased her dependency on the Soviet Union, there were real opposition to this development which manifested itself fully after the 1973 war.

*This was brought out to the author by Saad Eddin Ibrahim in an interview conducted at American University, Cairo, in September 1984.

The masses and the elite saw the Egypt of the late seventies in similar light as that of Nasser's following the 1967 war. Sadat merely shifted Egypt's earlier dependency on the Soviet Union to the United States. It could be argued that had Sadat's promises to Egypt's impoverished masses of prosperity -- exaggerated as they were -- been achieved, that the complaints about the departure from nonalignment would have fallen on deaf ears. Politics and economics in Egypt are closely related to the leadership's calculus of survival.

Moustapha Amin, an old and influential journalist with ties to the original Wafd party, recently compared Egypt's relation with the United States under Mubarak and Sadat. He said "Egypt in Mubarak's era is not sitting on America's lap but is sitting next to her. You will also notice that there is room there for the Soviet Union to also sit down." [Ref. 10] Sadat had hoped to make the United States dependent on Egypt and not Israel, and for their relationship to reflect that position. He wished to prove to the U.S. that it is in her interest to deal with Egypt and that this will help America's interests, plans, and policies in the region much more than if she relied on Israel; Egypt would replace Israel. Moreover, the U.S. must be made to realize, in theory and in practice, that her interests in Egypt are more vital than in Israel. Therefore, for Sadat this meant weaving Egypt into an American regional strategy [Ref. 10]. This obviously limited the options available to the Egyptian leadership in the conduct of

its foreign policy and Mubarak was determined from the start to widen his margin of freedom in his external policies.

Mubarak had announced that he intends to continue Sadat's policies. There were immediate skepticism by some Arab leaders and even by the internal opposition, claiming this to be just a formality. Ghali defended Mubarak calling Sadat's policies concerning the Middle East crisis "...a basic principle in our foreign policy...Egypt intends to continue the peace process established by the Camp David agreements as long as there are no other viable alternatives being developed and accepted by the parties concerned." [Ref. 12] Mubarak's Egypt though was not making the Camp David framework the sole vehicle for peace in the area. He was willing to consider other ideas as long as they were acceptable by all parties concerned [Ref. 11;p. 51]. Egypt would no longer give an immediate 'no' to new plans. The Fahd/Fez plan or a call for an international conference were considered with regards to any positive points they may bring forward. That does not mean that Egypt's leadership had become less realistic, on the contrary, there was no harm, they reasoned, in considering those other options so as not to unduly upset their Arab neighbors or undermine international efforts. The Egyptian leadership was and still is quick to point out that any framework for peace needs to be implemented and that necessitates the cooperation of the U.S. and Israel; hence, they remain realistic when evaluating all the plans and their chance for implementation [Ref. 12].

Mubarak is aware that in order to attract foreign capital investment and to face his current economic problems he needs a stable domestic environment. To him, the quest for peace is directly related to the above goal,

"We opted for peace because we want to save the enormous funds that we spend on arms and equipment to use them for the prosperity of the Egyptian people...there is no retreat from peace...what befell us throughout 30 years is enough."

He also was hoping to exploit Egypt's special relations with Israel to Egypt's advantage: "I would like to tell the Arab brothers that our excellent relations with Israel will be in the interests of the Arabs in the future. We will be able to solve their differences with Israel." Mubarak was hoping to turn what many had considered a liability into an asset. However, subsequent events in Lebanon have made that most difficult. [Ref. 12]

Ibrahim Sa'dah is a young journalist with a bright future and he brings new and fresh blood in the government supported press. His columns are avidly read by Egypt's politicized college students who tend to accept his analysis more readily than by those "established" figures in print. Writing a few weeks after Sadat's assassination on prospects for peace and the coming Israeli evacuation of Sinai, he notes that Egypt cannot afford to break the peace plan:

"[Egypt] would lose world support and more importantly still the trust and friendship of the United States... If this happens no U.S. president would then dare to continue to support Egyptian policy and not a single American voice would be raised in favor of providing

the Egyptian Army with its arms requirements. We would not hear a single word of support for the economic aid that the United States gives to Egypt...a retaliatory war would be bound to break out between Egypt and Israel...Egypt despite itself would return to the Soviet Union which would not receive it with an embrace but would force it to go down on its knees and ask for forgiveness and pardon for what it had done to it...."

"On the other hand, Israel would appear before the west as the only trusted ally in the Middle East and the only one who really desires to achieve peace."

"Not a single voice would be raised should Israel wage a lightning war against Egypt; would not hear a single sympathetic voice if Israel succeeded in reoccupying Sinai and once again reached the banks of the Suez Canal...We would have to cancel all our programs of securing our food supplies and developing our economy and country." [Ref. 13]

We can readily see how this commentary's point of departure is first and foremost Egypt's national interest which the Mubarak regime has been keen on attaining. But his is different from the "Egypt First" philosophy of Sadat in style and presentation. Mubarak is not attacking the Arab leaders or their country men as Sadat had often done [Ref. 14]. Mubarak in an interview with Barbara Walters before his inauguration ceremony asserted that "Egypt is an Arab country, we are not part of the west or the east." [Ref. 15] And on another occasion in March 1982 he said, "we are an inseparable part of the Arab world, and we have had good relations with it for hundreds of years." [Ref. 16] It is of interest that when Mubarak declared his policy of not attacking any of the Arab leaders in the Egyptian media he felt some obligation to couch it as continuation of Sadat's policy. Mubarak suggests

that Sadat was about to embark on that same policy and that it had been discussed by the cabinet [Ref. 17].

Also, Mubarak has not been openly emphasizing Egypt's leadership role in the region. His predecessor had used that motif on numerous occasions in his verbal attacks on the Arab countries. This does not indicate that Mubarak believes any less in Egypt's role but is more careful and sensitive in his utterances. For Sadat the Arabs without Egypt could do nothing while Egypt is great with or without the Arabs. In contrast, Mubarak has asserted that the Arab world cannot forego Egypt and vice versa [Ref. 18].

Mubarak is not an adherent of Arab unity from the Gulf to the Atlantic for he does not believe the necessary conditions will come about in the near future, he sees Arab unity as an out-dated concept. Instead he says it is "high time for an effective Arab forum able to solve problems better than that available today in the Arab League in Tunis." [Ref. 19] Mubarak is advocating a unified stand by the Arab countries on vital and strategic issues as a first step. Reflecting this assessment, an Al-Ahram article in the wake of the Israeli annexation of the Golan Heights states:

"Israel is well aware of the Arab reality and knows perfectly well the limits of Arab anger and of possible Arab moves....It knows only too well that the U.S. attitude will not go beyond words of condemnation unless there is a unified Arab plan in the face of danger...[we need] an Arab decision based on sound Arab vision, on a unified stand and designated roles and, above all, on an accurate knowledge of the balance of power and western and U.S. interests throughout our Arab region." [Ref. 20]

The article goes on to dissuade the fears of any Arab leader (mainly Saudi Arabia) who might feel that Egypt wishes to be the only go-in-between for the Arabs in Washington, "We are convinced that more than one Arab capital can play the newly expected role with the Reagan administration."

We have presented earlier how Sadat hoped to become the linchpin in any American strategy in the Middle East as the means to secure economic and military aid for Egypt. Sadat was stressing the bilateral nature of this relationship, hoping to keep Israel out of the equation; that is to say, Israel would not become a factor in any U.S. economic or military aid/sale proposals to Egypt. The American decision process would be solely based on Egypt's case as the trustworthy ally of the United States, who bellows out anti-communist and anti-Soviet rhetoric and is willing to act if need be as a regional policeman.

Mubarak was in Washington in September/October of 1981 hoping to speed up delivery of promised U.S. aircraft and other military hardware which Sadat had queried about earlier in August. These included the advanced F-16 fighter which at least to the Egyptian Air Force (EAF) would symbolize an equal or near equal treatment of Egypt and Israel militarily. The United States even though it had earlier provided Egypt thirty-five F-4 aircraft, was perceived to be dragging its feet. Mubarak, being the ex-Commandant of the EAF, was probably even more sensitive to the armed forces' needs in

general and the air force in particular. He had witnessed Sadat's strategy to lure the United States and saw that the results did not match expectations. Sadat, Mubarak, and the Egyptian decision-making elite firmly believed that the United States should be more forthcoming on its promises to Egypt and to deal with her on an equal footing with Israel.

Sadat knew that he can maintain his immediate credibility within Egypt by regaining the Sinai, but he also was keen on soliciting U.S. pressure on Israel to be more compromising on the autonomy issue. This was directly tied to any future role he aspired to play in the Arab world. In a September 1981 speech in Alexandria, Sadat was attacking those who were involved in sectarian sedition. He took the occasion however, to call for peace in the region:

"...We shall continue to work with Israel for the sake of the Palestinian issue. We will not speak on behalf of the Palestinians or the rest of the Arabs, but we want to end the Israeli occupation of the East Bank and Gaza so that the Palestinians can sit with the Israelis as I have done and ask for their land and reach an agreement as we have done with Israel." [Ref. 21]

All this must have been later used in the 'lessons learned' category for the new Mubarak regime. He witnessed how Sadat was unable to make any progress with Israel on the autonomy talks and the frustrations during the two weeks at Camp David* reflecting an erroneous Egyptian assessment of influence and

*See former Egyptian Foreign Minister Ibrahim Kamel's memoirs of the Camp David negotiations in *Al-Salam Al-Da'i, The Lost Peace*, Jeddah, 1984.

power in the Egyptian - American - Israeli triangle. Also, the manner in which his predecessor met his death, the perceptive rise in Islamic fundamentalism with its attacks on the west with its support of Zionism as well as the atheist east, in addition to the abuses of power and open corruption within the Sadat entourage must also have left a mark on Mubarak. Moreover, Egypt's unacceptable alienation in the Arab world and diminutive position in the nonaligned movement in conjunction with the above realities forced upon Mubarak a new tack or approach to handle the United States as Egypt began to reopen diplomatically, politically, and economically to the world once more.

Mubarak assessed Sadat's American strategy to be more costly than beneficial to his regime's survival and in meeting Egypt's national interests. He was fully aware that Egypt needed the United States or more precisely those services that only the U.S. could provide -- peace, economic development and aid. He still wishes to have strong bilateral relations with the U.S. where Egypt's requests are not subjected to an Israeli litmus test. Mubarak wants to be able to deal with Reagan or any U.S. president as a leading member of a united -- at least in vision -- Arab world. He has foregone any dream that Sadat might have fancied about replacing Israel as the American ally in the region. Egypt's inherent strength and power source will once again stem from an Arab instead of an American fountain. This more than any other action caused

a shift in Egyptian conception of the new reality. However, Egypt remains desirous to court the U.S. as Kamal Hassan Ali said in a lecture at the Commanders and Staff College in October 1983: "In its relations with the U.S., Egypt does not forget the realities of the age and the advantages which it, its people and its region, can gain from friendship with the greatest power in today's world." [Ref. 22]

Moustapha Khalil, the former deputy NDP leader for foreign affairs, and prime minister under Sadat, is considered to favor the policies of the late president and hence dubbed a 'Sadatist' by some [Ref. 23]. In a September 1981 speech commemorating the opening session of the second NDP Congress in Cairo, Khalil endorsed the rights of the "fraternal Palestinian people". He said,

"...the real guarantee of security and stability in the region is the settlement of the Palestinian problem in a way that will respond to the legitimate rights and hopes of the Palestinian people and provide security for all. Claims to the contrary are gross prevarications in which some circles are taking refuge by claiming that the tension and instability in the region are not related to the Palestinian problem but to regional differences and bickerings as well as rivalries among some of the ruling regimes. These circles have forgotten that letting the Palestinian problem remain unsolved means the continued prevalence of the feeling that the Israeli peril exceeds the Soviet peril...this feeling increased in the wake of the Israeli raid against the Iraqi nuclear reactor and the extensive military operations in Lebanon....It is essential to start solving the Palestinian problem, because otherwise the USSR will be able to penetrate into the region from the inside." [Ref. 24]

What is significant here is that an influential 'Sadatist' is reaffirming the rights of Palestinians and saying that

before we face aggression external to the region, we need to solve the main problem within the region. The primacy of that conflict on regional politics could never be underestimated. The goals of Sadat and Mubarak coincide but their relevant importance on the national agenda differs as do the means dedicated to their fulfillment.

Egypt under Sadat and Mubarak is a firm believer in peace as a long-term strategy as was presented earlier. This in itself also causes constraints on its options in foreign policy. Since war is not a part of Egypt's strategy today or in the near future then the Soviet Union cannot be a convincing card for Egypt to parade with. The peace options rest with the United States, Israel, and to a lesser degree with a unified European stand, and the Soviet Union. An additional force that would be influential is a unified Arab will, if and when it materializes. Therefore with the existing structural constraints on Egyptian foreign policy Mubarak's only immediate option was to bring back the nonalignment principles into his policies, open-up to Western Europe, and in the medium term to work on getting back to the Arab fold. Also in the latter category we could include the cautious normalizing with the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, but these were not viewed as pressing at the time.

Two objectives would be hoped for. First, to show the U.S. that Egypt is a regional and international actor which must be considered in any dealings in the area independent

of its relation with Israel. Secondly, to make Egypt less dependent on the United States, even if this is not actually achieved, it will still be a positive psychological boost.

We have seen how even under the best of conditions relations between two nations can still be less than ideal. The Israeli invasion of June 1983 and its subsequent consequences have caused a tremendous strain on Egyptian-Israeli relations and a nearly equal one on Egyptian-American relations. Egypt's decisional calculus was heavily tasked to maintain a balance between its national interests and Egyptian and Arab dignity. Egypt and the Arab's helplessness became evident in the face of the events of that summer. Egypt hoped to use its influence with Israel and the U.S. to contain any Israeli expansionist ideas but it discovered how little leverage it had in June of 1982.

Up to April of that year Egypt had according to Osama Al-Baz, the director of the presidential political office and a most influential member of the foreign policy team, been successful in holding back Israel. He said:

"President Sadat and later President Mubarak spoke to Israel about the danger of playing the game of Lebanese politics...the escalation of tension might reach a point where it will be difficult to control...I recall that four times, as a precautionary measure, we contacted Israel in order to prevent it from carrying out military operations. We also contacted European parties and the United States so that they too would contact Israel and take a firm line with it." [Ref. 25]

The United States came under attack during that summer in the Egyptian press. The Israeli invasion and the seige of

Beirut carried a very high cost for a Mubarak regime that is maintaining special relations with the United States who is seen as unwilling to control or restrain Israel.

A review of the leading Egyptian newspapers a few days following the invasion indicate how the U.S. could not escape being implicated in the event. Al-Goumhoriya, one of the three national newspapers, in an editorial on 9 June says:

"Israel is challenging all values and international conventions, depending on the special status it enjoys in U.S. policy concerns and the special relationship it has with the U.S.....While one cannot reconcile oneself to its consequences if this means further Israeli aggression....Will the U.S. continue to accept this special relationship with Israel even if Israel grossly violates its commitments toward this relationship and continues its aggression?"

Mubarak, in a June interview, reflected his disillusion with the manner in which the U.S. had handled the events. Replying to a question about the effect of a long Israeli stay in Lebanon, he said:

"It will affect not only Egyptian-American relations, but American-Arab relations. The image of the United States is not only at stake. If the crisis continues and Israeli forces stay there for quite a long time, it would create much more trouble. The United States will lose more ground, and some other power will gain." [Ref. 26]

He added that if the United States fails to bring about a settlement to this crisis, the whole world will blame the U.S., especially the Arab world, and that the Soviet Union would be the only country to gain from this.

During this period there were calls urging for change in Egyptian foreign policy in view of the events in Lebanon. The leftist opposition National Progressive Unionist Grouping

(NPUG) party made such a demand in its press organ Al-Ahali in an article by Philip Jallub. He does not suggest that Egypt should attack Israel, for "such folly or fancy did not cross our mind." [Ref. 27] He does suggest that there is a basic fault in Egyptian foreign policy that should be rectified; this can be done by convening a conference for all national forces, according to Jallub. Even the respectable Al-Ahram urged for a change in U.S. foreign policy in the region [Ref. 28].

Mubarak had hoped that his efforts at convincing Reagan to initiate a dialogue with the Palestinians would bear fruit. There was a general feeling at the foreign ministry and the cabinet that Israel's invasion was timed to destroy any hope for such a dialogue. The American veto of the French draft resolution on Lebanon at the UN security council was a great disappointment for Egypt and Mubarak [Ref. 29]. The United States was judged not qualified to resolve the crisis [Ref. 30]; while opposition papers urged breaking off relations with the United States [Ref. 32] forcing the national press to defend government policies [Ref. 33].

In a possible move to deflect some of the criticism, the weekly Mayo magazine, mouthpiece of the ruling NDP, published an article by Ibrahim Sa'dah. He questions why some people are angry over the Soviet's inaction in Lebanon. To those who feel that the Soviets are obligated to defend the Palestinians he writes, "We are trying to impose on them a

stand that has not crossed their mind and does not even deserve consideration." He adds in an urge to marshal Arab unity, "Are we so naive as to imagine we can impose our policies on the superpowers and push them toward defending our interests and fighting for the sake of our cause?...."

[Ref. 34]

Moustapha Khalil, summed up the regime's position when he said:

"In evaluating its foreign policy the United States looks at things only within the context of its differences with the Soviet Union. We say to it: there is only one threat to the area -- Israel -- and the invasion of Lebanon has categorically proved that Israel is the principal threat to the stability of the Arab countries....The Soviet Union is another threat, but the degrees of threat differ."
[Ref. 34:p. 11]

The Reagan plan of 1 September 1982 was greeted with guarded optimism in the Arab world. Egypt's media welcomed the initiative [Ref. 35] and demanded a unified Arab stand to implement its positive aspects. Some even compared it to the initiative of the late president Eisenhower in 1956 compelling Israel to withdraw from Sinai [Ref. 36]. By mid-November, Al-Ahram was wondering if the U.S. would follow-up the "Reagan Plan" with some concrete action in order to convince the doubters that "this initiative was not merely a U.S. pill to calm Arab feelings against what appeared to be U.S.-Israeli collusion in Lebanon...." [Ref. 37]

Mohamed Heikal provided his views on the events in Lebanon and the Reagan plan in his usual power-politics approach:

"I believe the plan [Reagan's] was proposed in the aftermath of what happened in Beirut to absorb the anger and agony of the Arab world, and it has done that. I believe that although Reagan has the power to apply the plan, he does not have the intention to use that power....Because Israel does not want it, and Israel is there on the ground." [Ref. 38]

The impact of the Lebanese conflict on American-Egyptian relations can be clearly seen in the above discussion. We shall not engage ourselves in the details of the remaining events of the Lebanese saga for it would only be more of the same. You would see two major policies reflecting those forces on the ground: Israel and Syria. The United States is unable to successfully match policy and implements in Lebanon and suffers a tragic setback, losing credibility in the eyes of its regional supporters. Egypt, meanwhile, is unable to influence any of the parties to the conflict and resides itself to innocuous diplomatic shuttles [Ref. 39] and escorting Yasser Arafat from his seige in Tripoli.

One essential point that should be covered is the shelling by the U.S. 6th fleet units of Syrian and Druze positions near Beirut at the end of 1983. Two main points came about from these actions:

- (1) The increased disillusionment by the average man on the street in Cairo with the U.S. [Ref. 40], causing the Egyptian regime to distance itself from its friend's actions in its backyard. This again reflected the relative impotence of the Egyptian state to control events which was not missed by the politicized masses.
- (2) Syria's Assad became a bigger hero in the Arab world. He took on the legendary U.S. 6th fleet and reciprocated the bloody nose. The United States had

inadvertently elevated Assad's status in the Arab world and the key actor keeping Mubarak from returning to the Arab fold where Egypt could exercise and regain some lost influence. The United States by engaging and shelling Syrian forces was enhancing Assad's position regardless of the military outcome. Mubarak and all the moderate Arab leaders were forced to criticize the event due to domestic pressures. In Cairo, they wondered if the U.S. was purposely elevating Assad.

Therefore, the combination of U.S. and Israeli actions made many Egyptian observers comment that the U.S. was back to its old tricks of the 1960s. Dr. Murad Ghaleb, a former Egyptian foreign minister and currently a member of the opposition, suggested that the U.S. had established its policy towards Egypt with the following points in mind [Ref. 41]:

- (1) To keep Egypt within its borders, that is by separating her from the Arab world.
- (2) To limit the size and available armament of the Egyptian military forces.
- (3) To have Egypt sign the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty.
- (4) To establish peace between Egypt and Israel.

Many political observers would agree and also add that the Soviet Union would not have been unhappy with that either. Historically, within the Egyptian decision-making elite there has been a feeling, with varying intensity, that the super-powers would never allow Egypt to reach its full political or military potential. They reason that an independently powerful Egypt would never be tolerated by the two giants.

Mubarak, during a trip to the United States, presented in a speech to the council on Foreign Relations in New York five mistaken concepts which confuse the issues in the Middle East [Ref. 42]:

- (1) The existence of an identity of interests between the United States and any state in the Middle East. He emphasized that there are common interests in specific fields and that a good deal of good intentions await the U.S. But this does not mean that there is a general consensus on the common interests. Therefore, the U.S. should not be totally biased toward one state while it is mapping out its Middle East policy.
- (2) The second myth is that the best solution to the Middle East problem is to leave it without a solution. He argues that this is based on two wrong beliefs:
 - A. There is a specific problem which is impossible to solve.
 - B. Time alone will provide solutions to the complicated problems.
- (3) A third myth says that the Arab world's weakness and division is in the interests of the United States. The fact is, he asserts, that the Arab division creates more instability and tension in the region and it will affect the flow of oil to the west and open the door for foreign interference. A strong Arab front -- one of unity of purpose and not constitutional unity -- will provide a real opportunity for cooperation on the basis of equality and mutual respect.
- (4) Another myth is that the continuation of the Iran-Iraq war might serve the U.S. interests. Mubarak is convinced that it is not in the U.S. interest to see tension rising in the Gulf; the security and stability of this area bears a direct impact on the prosperity of the industrialized world.
- (5) The last myth states that the establishment of a Palestinian entity is a detrimental thing for the west. But, he suggests, the majority of the Palestinians who will set up this entity currently reside in the West Bank and the Gaza strip. They are for the most part moderates wishing for amicable relations with other states. Furthermore, the Palestinian entity will face an enormous task of reconstruction and repatriation. This will cause the entity to cultivate close ties with the moderate Arab states who are able to provide the needed help.

A presentation of a perceptive article [Ref. 43] in Al-Ahram during the spring of this year regarding American-Egyptian

relations will aid in summarizing how Egypt has viewed this relationship. Dr. Al-Mashat, of Cairo University, in his article, hopes to provide a guideline for the continuation of the close ties which both countries enjoy and containing those factors which can harm cooperation. Before offering his solution, he advances two fundamental mistakes he believes the United States committed while formulating its relations with Egypt. The first was when the

"United States did not look at Egyptian-U.S. relations from their dual aspect and did not seek to develop them on the basis of joint interests of both countries. On the contrary the United States turned this dual and mutual aspect into a complex one by including Israeli interests as a basic element in the equation...thus letting the channels of political, economic, and military interaction and exchange pass through Israel first... this is bound to have negative effects on the relations between the two countries, particularly when Egyptian-Israeli relations are not in harmony...."

The second mistake advanced by Mashat is:

"the attempt of the United States to impose the U.S. national security view on the countries of the area, particularly Egypt. The U.S. view [Strategic Consensus] is based on encircling and containing Soviet influence in the world as a primary condition for the achievement of security and stability....Since the Arab countries, including Egypt, regard Arab national security differently from that of the U.S. and consider that the essence of the former is solving the Palestinian problem, it is natural that this should affect the warmth of Egyptian-U.S. relations since Egypt is a central regional country that is basically interested in solving the regional conflict whereas the United States as a superpower is more interested in the international conflict."

In addition Mashat writes that U.S. response to Egypt's attempts to restore its relations with the sisterly Arab states, and to crystallize a regional national concept of Arab security have been less than enthusiastic.

Turning to his recommendations, Mashat feels it is imperative that Egyptian relations be based on mutual respect for the political will of both sides and, consequently, the independence of the Egyptian will and decision-making must always be recognized without angering the United States. That these relations be kept out of the vortex of current-events such as the American elections. Moreover,

"The United States must help Egypt in its attempt to regain a central Egyptian political role in the Arab region. The U.S. should not consider this as a threat to its interest since a central Egyptian role would be a unifying factor and would lessen the causes of disruption...contributing to the Arab national consensus."

He compares the current U.S. "extreme support and bias" in favor of Israel with that during the 1967-1973 period, with a reminder of the earlier result. He concludes that

"the decision-makers in both countries should not view these elements of tension in light of election year alone, for they are more deeply rooted and permanent than merely election campaigns. Trying to deal with them requires basic changes in realization, understanding, and mutual policies."

V. POLITICO-DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION AND THE NONALIGNED MOVEMENT

A. USSR

The Soviet Union once enjoyed a great latitude in its conduct with Egypt, especially following the June War. This was greatly reduced with Sadat's expulsion of Soviet advisors (15,000-20,000) in July of 1972. Egyptian-Soviet relations continued from bad to worse with little exception reaching their nadir in September of 1981 with the expulsion of the Soviet ambassador and other officials [Ref. 1]. Our discussion here will deal primarily with the period following the September events on the eve of Mubarak's assumption of power.*

Mubarak inherited a soured relationship with the Soviets from Sadat. In March 1976, Sadat cancelled the treaty of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union; in January 1980, in reaction to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, Sadat instructed the Soviet government to reduce its staff in Cairo to be more in line with the number of Egyptian diplomats in Moscow (12). Moreover, the Egyptian ambassador designate, Samih Anwar, to Moscow had remained in Cairo as relations between the two countries continued to sour. By October the

*For a discussion of earlier Egyptian-Soviet relations see: M. Heikal's The Cairo Documents; Road to Ramadan; and The Sphinx and the Commissar. Also, A. Z. Rubinstein's Red Star on the Nile.

diplomatic representation in both countries had been reduced to the Charge d'Affairs level.

There were early indications that the strained relations between the two countries would not be a permanent facet of Egyptian foreign policy. President Mubarak, in an interview a week after his election, replied to a question about his country's future Soviet relations by expressing the need to establish normal relations with all states but on an equal basis [Ref. 2]. A few days later Mubarak again predicted better relations

"Time is certain to improve relations between the two countries. As to the conditions...namely, mutual respect and noninterference in our affairs. This was the only problem which harmed the friendly relations between the two countries." [Ref. 3]

By late January of 1982, it was reported that the Soviet Union had been given permission by Egypt to increase its embassy supported staff [Ref. 4]. Foreign Minister Kamal Hassan Ali was quick to assure the United States that the possible improvement in relations with Moscow would not affect relations with Washington which he hopes will get even better [Ref. 5]. Al-Ahram was also quick to downplay Egypt's request for Soviet experts [Ref. 6]. The stress was on the economic rational for the decision and that it was devoid of any political consideration. The 66 Soviet experts were expected to carry out previously contracted work at various Soviet equipped industrial complexes [Ref. 7].

Following Mubarak's February 1982 trip to Washington, the Egyptian press was in defense of his policies, one of which was the return of the Soviet experts. The chief editor of Al-Akhbar defended that decision tagging it as a continuation of Sadat's policies

"...Sadat repeatedly said before expelling the Soviet ambassador from Egypt that Egypt is not against normal relations with the Soviet Union and if Moscow takes one step, Egypt is prepared to take two steps.... Therefore there is nothing new in the matter...." [Ref. 8]

The popular journalist Ibrahim Sa'dah upheld the return of the Soviet technicians and future normalization in a commentary geared to calm the "sensational" reports in some U.S. circles. He also provided his views on Egypt's experience with the Soviet Union. Although the Soviets were once Egypt's ally, "they would not let us make friends with those who were not friendly with them or cooperate with those who threatened or condemned them." Sa'dah continues "...it is not necessary for the Egyptian and Soviet peoples to embrace, and it is not expected that the two countries will become close...what is required is that there be normal relations." In close he ridicules those expecting Egypt to restore cooperation with the Soviet Union at the expense of deteriorating relations with the United States. [Ref. 9]

Mubarak and the Egyptian leadership have been extremely cautious in approaching the Soviet Union. Each gesture toward the Kremlin was backed by several to Washington to eliminate any possible misunderstandings, this was especially

true with this first step. The Egyptian leadership did not hesitate to criticize the Soviet Union. Such a stand was taken following the return of Sinai to Egyptian sovereignty, when the Soviet permanent UN envoy delivered a message critical of Egypt's foreign policies. Dr. Esmat Abdel Meguid, then permanent Egyptian representative at the UN, delivered a message at that forum in response to the Soviet position [Ref. 10]. An earlier criticism of the Soviet Union occurred a few days following Sadat's assassination. The Soviet government released a statement to the effect that pressure is being exerted on Egypt and that attempts are being made to interfere in Egypt in its domestic affairs. Egypt countered by accusing the Soviet Union of interfering in its domestic policy and those of Chad and Afghanistan [Ref. 11].

Within the realm of nonaligned principles which Egypt was now reasserting under Mubarak, it did need to work toward normalization of relations with the Soviet Union. Four months before the Lebanese war, Boutros-Ghali was commenting on the Soviet role in the peace process. He said,

"We did not exclude the Soviet Union...there is an invitation to the Soviet Union as one of the big five powers...the only difference pertains to timing, stage, and role of the Soviet Union...when we move from the first stage to the third and fourth stages...." [Ref. 1]

Ibrahim Nafi', writing six weeks after the Lebanese war, sees cooperation of the superpowers as a necessary condition to solve the Palestinian problem. Nafi' possibly goes beyond Ghali when he suggests "...we should not belittle the Soviet

role...despite the fact that it lacks the capabilities to move the situation toward a solution, it can obstruct a comprehensive solution...." [Ref. 13] Throughout all this, Mubarak was always asserting that "We have a special relationship with it [U.S.] and I cannot abandon this special relationship." [Ref. 14]

The death of Brezhnev provided the stage for possible improvement in relations between the two countries. Mamdouh Salem was sent to Moscow as the Egyptian representative at the funeral of the Soviet leader. These talks were supposedly held with Vasiliy Kuznetsov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Subsequently, Anatoliy Gromyko, son of the Soviet foreign minister, payed an unofficial visit to Egypt in January 1983. These were followed by Nikolai Baybakov's stopover in Cairo airport enroute to and from Addis Ababa [Ref. 15]. He was met by assistant foreign minister Ashafi' Abdel Hamid, again this was in an unofficial capacity. Baybakov was supposed to have delivered three Soviet conditions for the return of ambassadors. First, to solve the problems of the Egyptian debt to the Soviet Union. Secondly, to expand the range of cooperation between the two countries. Thirdly, to require some guarantees that what happened in the last few years will not be repeated [Ref. 16]. In May, an Egyptian commercial and industrial delegation signed a new trade protocol in Moscow between the two countries worth in excess of \$200 million [Ref. 17]. It was the first such protocol to be signed in six years.

Concurrent with these meetings, the Seventh Nonaligned Summit was convening in New Delhi. Egypt placed great importance on this summit as Mubarak headed the Egyptian delegation. Throughout this period there were unsubstantiated reports of 'secret' talks being held with the Soviet Union [Ref. 18], and reports that Cairo had hoped to resume normal relations with Moscow prior to the nonaligned summit [Ref. 19]. Mubarak at this time was affirming the Soviet Union's political importance and using the case of India as a model for foreign policy conduct

"The Soviet Union is a superpower and we cannot ignore it. We are a nonaligned state just like India, which has special industrial and economic relations with the Soviet Union and at the same time relations with the United States." [Ref. 20]

Meanwhile, Kamal Hassan Ali confirmed that "1983 would witness the exchange of ambassadors between Egypt and the eastern bloc, Cyprus and Soviet Union...." [Ref. 21]

The influential Osama Al-Baz, Mubarak's political speech writer and director of the presidential political office, reflected the government's irritation over the U.S. veto in August at the UN over Israeli settlements in the occupied territories in a press interview. At the same time, he was blaming the Arabs for not taking a unified clear-cut stand. He added that it was unrealistic for any state to think of distancing the Soviet Union from the area, and that Egypt will never seek to keep away the Soviet Union or any state interested in achieving peace and able to make any contribution to it [Ref. 22].

During the same week the opposition NPUG party called for the exchange of ambassadors with the Soviet Union in its party organ, Al-Ahali [Ref. 23].

The government however, was still cautious in its diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. Oleg Grinevskiy, chief of the Near Eastern department at the Soviet Foreign ministry, arrived in Cairo for a four day visit. It was said that Grinevskiy had sought an official invitation from Cairo but the request was declined, rendering this an unofficial visit [Ref. 24].

During Mubarak's September 1983 visit to Washington, the Egyptian delegation felt there was a move to introduce some doubt over the close U.S. - Egyptian relationship, specifically with regards to an Egyptian-Romanian tank deal. The journalist Ibrahim Sa'dah had accompanied the Egyptian delegation and wired back his rejoinder to the attack he perceived in the American press. He wrote:

"What is important is this interference by Israeli and American spokesmen in a matter that is strictly an Egyptian internal affair. Egypt is not a country in the U.S. orbit and is not obliged to obtain prior approval from the U.S. in its relations with other countries, be they eastern or western....It is true that it has distinguished relations with the U.S.... while its relations with the Soviet Union...are cool and have been almost frozen in the past years, but this does not prevent Egypt from restoring its relations with the Soviet Union to a normal state should it find this beneficial to it and to its people." [Ref. 25]

Less than a month later Mubarak was again criticizing the Soviet Union for interfering in Egypt's domestic affairs:

"...the latest manifestation of this interference [is] their official comment on the recently held legislative [Shura] elections...they are still interfering in our local affairs. When they stop this the ambassadors will return, not before." [Ref. 26]

Egyptian officials began to publicly outline the direction they felt the Soviet Union ought to take in promoting the peace effort. They foresee the Soviet Union playing a potentially constructive role in the region with some positive steps. According to Al-Baz:

"The Soviet Union, through its contacts with the other power, should give a certain priority to the Middle East and should make clear to the U.S. that peace in the Middle East is high on the agenda and it is as important as the question of disarmament and nonproliferation of arms." [Ref. 27]

In April 1984 Vladimir Polyakov, former Soviet ambassador to Cairo, made an official visit to Cairo. During his extended four day visit he met with Al-Baz, Boutros-Ghali, and Abdel Halim Badawi in discussing bilateral relations and the current Middle East situation [Ref. 28]. Both sides seemed optimistic following these talks. A month earlier, Mubarak had renewed the trade exchange agreement between the two countries [Ref. 29]. A few days after Polyakov's departure from Cairo, an initial agreement was reached to exchange ambassadors, however no dates for implementation were mentioned [Ref. 30]. A few weeks later, Boutros-Ghali asserted that the exchange of ambassadors between the two countries is only a procedural decision [Ref. 31]. On 7 July 1984 both countries announced without any fanfare the agreement to exchange ambassadors between Cairo and Moscow.

Boutros-Ghali commenting after the announcement said:

"...[it] came as a culmination of the phase which began more than two years ago...[it] is a mere practical application of the nonaligned policy...the real identity of its foreign policy...Egypt's leadership in the Arab world forces it to always have balanced relations with the superpowers....The United States knows that for Egypt to play its role in the region, it must have relations with Moscow without these relations being antagonistic with Washington." [Ref. 32]

The opposition parties in Egypt supported the government by its approval of the impending ambassadorial exchange. Dr. Walid Ra'fat of the New Wafd party lauded the government's decision stating that a balanced relationship between both superpowers is a necessity and Moscow must respect Egypt's sovereignty by not interfering in its internal affairs; of course this is applicable to the United States also, he added. The Socialist Labor party's Ibrahim Shukri voiced a similar view with the Wafd spokesman, adding "...I am certain that sound and objective reasoning would not lead the United States to think that deteriorating relations between Egypt and the Soviet Union could be beneficial to her ties with Egypt." The NPUG spokesman, Dr. Rif'at El-Said, hoped that this is a positive step "which needs to be followed by more steps until we reach a point of balance between the superpowers." El-Umma party and its president, Ahmed El-Sabahi, greeted the decision favorably adding that he is in complete agreement with the Egyptian foreign policy. In addition, Ismail Fahmy, former foreign minister 1974-77, commented favorably on the exchange of ambassadors noting that severing

or reduction of diplomatic representation with the big powers is no longer a valid option in today's world. Moreover, Egypt cannot carry its full weight and perform a positive role unless it held constant and balanced communication with both superpowers. [Ref. 33]

A review of some Egyptian and Arab press reports in the July-August period indicate the overlapping of several issues and their effect on a country's mood toward the superpowers. Al-Gomhouriya commenting on the Kuwait-Soviet arms deal says that U.S. mistakes force the Arabs to turn to the Soviet Union,

"We do not go to Moscow willingly. The United States always forces us to do so. We are against communism by nature, and we realize that Soviet arms are far inferior to arms made in the west, but self-defense necessitates that we go to Moscow as long as the U.S. refuses to arm the Arabs....

"U.S. mistakes are recurring in the region and they continue, Israel and the Soviet Union are the first to benefit from this, and the Arabs are and will always be the losers unless they agree on a new and unified armament and arms manufacturing policy." [Ref. 34]

The last statement was also aimed to help Egypt's emerging arms industry. Similar views were expressed by Kamal Hassan Ali, "If the United States does not meet the requests of the Middle Eastern Arab states, then the Soviet Union will have a golden opportunity." [Ref. 35]

The Socialist Labor party in its organ Al-Sha'b questioned why the national press was attacking or belittling the Soviet Union, "Their papers either write apologetically about this step [normalization] or try to depict it as insignificant."

It also went on to say "Other articles proclaimed that the Soviet Union has repented and atoned for its grave fascist mistakes against us and therefore we have bestowed on it the honor of resuming relations with it." [Ref. 36]

Ambassador Salah Basyuni was expected to leave for Moscow the end of July to assume his new duties. The new ambassador had served in a similar capacity in Addis Ababa and Hungary. Shortly after his assignment in Moscow, Basyuni gave an unfortunate telephone interview* in which he was quoted saying "Arab solidarity will be the basis for dropping the Camp David card." [Ref. 37] An official spokesman at the Egyptian foreign ministry announced that these attributed statements are incorrect and distorted and do not reflect the policies of the Egyptian government [Ref. 38].

On September 24, the new Soviet ambassador, Alexander Bolotogov, presented his credentials to the Egyptian president along with five other new ambassadors thereby ending a three year gap in that position. The relations during this period concentrated on trade and economic relations between the two countries. There were at times some accusations on both sides of bad faith and interference in domestic affairs, but overall it was a much quieter period than under Sadat's last four years.

*It was indicated to the author while in Cairo that Basyuni was misquoted and that his comments caused great discomfort for Mubarak.

The role of ideology was not a factor in the Egyptian leadership's decision to normalize relations with the Soviet Union. That is to say that there are not certain individuals in the foreign policy decision-making process which have Marxists leanings and for those reasons desired normalizations. Instead state interests seem to have been the driving force in the decision taken.

The following collection of views of prominent Egyptian politicians will serve to illustrate. Moustapha Khalil, former prime minister and head of foreign policy committee in the ruling party: "I do not believe that ideology plays a fundamental part at all in the process of formulating foreign relations. Foreign policy is based first and foremost on interests." [Ref. 39] Ismail Fahmy, former foreign minister under Sadat, also asserts "...ideology has no place in political activity and political action and in making grave political decisions, whether these decisions have to do with peace or war." [Ref. 39] The seasoned Moustapha Khalil added:

"The most important thing for Egypt is to preserve its freedom of decision. If the course of Egyptian interests runs parallel to the interests of any of the superpowers and does not present any opposition to those interests, there would be no harm in Egypt having relations with this superpower...but to what extent could this relationship develop so as not to be considered as subordination, that is what must be considered." [Ref. 39:p. 30]

Egypt, by upgrading its diplomatic representation with the Soviet Union, is hoping to gain some influence over some of the events happening in the region in addition to obvious trade and economic benefits. Egypt is tied to Sudan with a

joint defense treaty and considers the Sudan vital to Egypt's economy, security and most importantly for its Nile water. Cairo would like to reduce the external pressure Nimeiri has been under lately, such as Libyan and Ethiopian aid to Sudanese rebels. In addition, several anti-Nimeiri coups had allegedly been planned or attempted by Qadhafi or his supporters in Sudan. To the east, Egypt would like Syria to be more forthcoming in easing its verbal attacks on Egypt. Syria has been the main force opposing Egypt's proposals to solve the Palestinian problem. Therefore it is hoped in Cairo that the Soviet Union will be able to influence some of its friends in a region Egypt is influenced by and wishes to gain more influence in.

Another dimension to this would be to exert some pressure on the United States and Israel to actively participate in solving the Palestinian issue. The Soviet Union has been encouraged to take positive actions to endorse the peace process and Mubarak has called for a European initiative [Ref. 40] to move the stalled process. Mubarak's call for a unified Arab strategy with a successful Palestinian-Jordanian dialogue as a first step can also be seen as additional pressure on Washington to move on the peace process.

One of Egypt's main goals in foreign policy is to bring peace and stability to the region and this can only be reached by solving the crux of the problem: the Palestinian problem. Egypt sees two options available to influence the U.S. and Israel:

- (1) To change the realities on the ground by resorting to conflict in order to improve the Arab's bargaining position, forcing the superpowers to intervene. This option is currently unavailable for Egypt and probably not in the foreseeable future either [Ref. 41]. So the Egyptian leadership really has just one option.
- (2) To bring as much external pressure on the other side that they are forced to act. This pressure would be in the form of a unified Arab stand, a strongly endorsed European initiative, a rallying of world opinion, the backing of the nonaligned nations, unilateral recognition of Israel by a unified PLO, and bringing into the peace process the permanent members of the UN security council. These measures, the Egyptian leadership feels, would put pressure on the American administration to convince Israel that comprehensive peace is the only way to assure security, stability and prosperity for all the peoples of the region. This strategy's point of departure is to believe in one's inherent ability to influence the situation, and not be at the mercy of external actors who may not have an interest in changing the status quo. The job won't get done unless you do it yourself.

B. NONALIGNED MOVEMENT

"Nasser represented one stage in Egypt's life and history with its own circumstances, decisions, needs, and surrounding problems. He had his own style of running the country's affairs. The circumstances at that time necessitated that he follows a certain line. Sadat's era was different from Nasser's era, and the circumstances and requirements of that era dictated a certain method of running the country's affairs. We had had a setback and wanted war, and there was no democracy, not to mention the other problems which Sadat had to cope with. I have introduced a new style. The war has ended and peace has been established... Sadat's style was different from Nasser's. Everyone has his own way of tackling the various issues...I do things gradually. I am not one of those who believe in solid blows or electric shocks." [Ref. 41:p. 20]

The Mubarak era has brought with it Egypt's reassertion of nonaligned policies as a fundamental guide in its foreign policy. A study [Ref. 42] comparing Sadat's last seven months

with Mubarak's first seven months, indicated that on only three occasions did Sadat mention nonalignment in any of his speeches. These citations were only in passing and lacked significance. By contrast Mubarak has been continuously advocating non-alignment and has made it a key guiding principle in Egypt's foreign policy. He has also discussed Egypt's leadership role in the movement. In a speech he made to the joint legislature in November 1981, Mubarak said,

"...we adhere to the policy of nonalignment and positive neutralism and call for the strengthening of the non-aligned movement and ridding it of the blemishes from which it has suffered in the last few years. These have cost the unity which had existed among the member countries in their heyday; and shook many of the fundamental beliefs on which their philosophy, procedure, and direction were established. And so, they have lost a great deal of effectiveness and influence on the international arena, and this phenomenon grieves us and we will work on its removal for we believe that the path of nonalignment is the preferred course which will realize the interest of the peoples in freedom, security, and justice... [and] Egypt is an Arab-African country, not eastern or western...Egypt will not revolve in the orbit of any state...." [Ref. 43]

A few months later, in celebration of the return of the Sinai, Mubarak gave another speech to a joint session of the legislature in which he emphasized nonalignment:

"...we resist the international polarization phenomenon and fight the policy of areas of influence which leads to causing a serious flaw in the international system, makes Third World peoples a mere instrument in the conflict between the superpowers and exposes their rights and interests to danger...Egypt will always remain in the vanguard of the forces defending the interests of peoples and human rights, calling for adherence to international legitimacy and the rule of law and seeking the establishment of a new international system...." [Ref. 44]

But this, Mubarak asserts, does not "preclude the establishment of close relations with the European, American and other states in the various fields." [Ref. 45]

It is clear that Mubarak and his foreign policy team set out to bring Egypt back to the forefront of the nonaligned movement and to correct what they saw as a deviation from the movement's basic founding principles. This was one way for the Egyptian leadership to regain some of its lost prestige and influence in the Third World since 1979. This move could also serve to reassert Egypt's independent judgement in its foreign policy, which many states and Egyptians had questioned during the last years under Sadat.

Ibrahim Nafi' published a book on democracy in Egypt on the eve of the May 1984 parliamentary elections. In it he discusses election issues, party platforms and highlights the "noble" efforts of the ruling party over the previous two and a half years. A few pages at the end of the book deal with foreign policy. Nafi' here describes Egypt's international credentials at the time Mubarak took power:

"Egypt...a 'stigma' within the nonaligned block was one of the three states who founded and declared the movement to the world. Accused of relinquishing the policies of nonalignment, by aligning and submitting to one of the superpowers...every nonaligned conference and meeting witnessed vicious attempts to expel Egypt from the movement." [Ref. 46].

Nafi' goes on to describe how Egypt's regional and international position has improved since Mubarak's assumption of power. Egypt has regained its leadership position in the Arab world and that it will not shirk on its Arab responsibilities

and in defending the area from foreign dangers. Moreover, "Egypt does not accept any interference in its national political will, and refuses to be part of either superpowers' strategy in the area." Nafi' does on to cover Egypt's "distinguished" position on the African continent and at the United Nation. [Ref. 46:pp. 124-132]

The Egyptian leadership has been trying to reduce the tension in the Middle East and to solve the Palestinian problem which they believe to be the root of the instability. This instability is an invitation to superpower regional interference which they hope to reduce.

"If the eastern and western camps adhere to the rules of the game in Europe to avoid a clash between them, they do not do so in the Middle East, which is still in an unbalanced state and where the rules of the international game are not yet clear," [Ref. 47]

comments Marshal Abu-Ghazalah.

The Egyptian Marshal also provided a way out of this international dilemma:

"[It is] due to the absence of an Arab will, which, if it asserts itself, can neutralize all this. For this reason I would say that the coming 10 years will be the most critical period in the history of Arab security. If the Arab nation wishes to live after the next 10 years its representatives must get together in order to lay down the basis of a national Arab security and a comprehensive Arab strategy." [Ref. 47]

This view suits the nonalignment posture adhered to by the Egyptian political leadership, well as the Egyptian diplomat Hafiz Ismail wrote "Egypt's solidarity with the Arab world is one of the bases of its nonalignment...." [Ref. 48]

Egypt believes that the Nonaligned movement cannot be a static concept but it must make changes and amendments to stay in harmony with changing international situations.

According to Nafi',

"...the essence of the policy of nonalignment has changed...[it] used to be liberation and independence for countries under the yoke of imperialism, and protection of the interests of Third World or, more accurately, poor states."

"We now believe...there is nothing to prevent any nonaligned state from having special relations with any superpower. We do not see this as a violation of the concept of nonalignment." [Ref. 49]

Therefore the task of nonaligned states, according to Egypt, has changed. Nafi' suggests that this task is to "prevent the proliferation of destructive weapons, bring an end to nuclear armaments, and...to finance development projects in the poor states...." [Ref. 49] Boutros-Ghali also sees the movement's immediate task "is to make the necessary efforts to ease the cold war and revive interest in a north-south dialogue to promote a new and more just economic order." [Ref. 50]

Mubarak in his United Nation General Assembly speech [Ref. 51] of September 1983 emphasized the "international economic crisis." For while the whole world was coming to grips with this crisis, the Third World nations of the south are struggling to survive. He advocated making structural amendments to the existing monetary, finance, and trade fields. He also made several proposals to outline a north-south dialogue. This reflects Egypt's desire to formulate

the nonaligned agenda items with emphasis on north-south dialogue and economic development while shifting somewhat from the removal of the "imperial yoke" days.

Egypt has also been very interested in regaining its vanguard role in Africa. The African bloc could play a more active and influential role within the nonaligned movement. Ghali believes that "Egypt's future is in Africa because there is more real room for Egypt's expertise in Africa than in the Arab states. Egypt's food security is in Africa, not in the Arab states, with the exception of Iraq...." [Ref. 52] So Africa provides Egypt with increased political influence and can serve to eliminate its dependence on extra-regional food imports. Ghali has personally conducted negotiations with Addis Ababa in the hope of harmonizing its relations with its neighbors, and Egypt's allies, Sudan and Somalia.

Returning to the political aspect of nonalignment, one should not conclude that they are dreamers or idealists in Cairo, as Abu-Ghazalah mentions:

"We realize that we are living in a world in which various interests are in conflict with each other, and where matters sometimes come to the point of a clash. However, we just as firmly believe that, no matter what conflicts exist, the possibility of reaching an understanding and solving disputes is always a possibility which is larger and more important than the possibility of war and destruction." [Ref. 53]

Perhaps this excerpt of an Al-Ahram article following the normalizing of relations between Egypt and the Soviet Union

best depict the reality of the international system and its effect on small and mid-size states:

"...a small country like Egypt, while seeking to defend its interests and restore if only part of the Arab rights in conditions of total Arab collapse, could not afford to maintain an absolutely equal balance in dealing with the two superpowers. Putting theories and slogans aside, practical necessities make it incumbent upon every country in today's world to be inclined toward this or that side in its relations with the superpowers to preserve its national interests and objectives in conditions of international polarization that cannot be ignored. However, a successful foreign policy is one that is capable of preventing relations with any country, particularly the superpowers, from reaching the point of breakdown and the withdrawal of ambassadors while, on the other hand preventing special relations with anybody reaching a degree of tutelage and blind obedience. This is what the policy of non-alignment requires, the policy to which Egypt is committed and which calls for a good degree of understanding with the two giants." [Ref. 54]

Academicians [Ref. 55], diplomats [Ref. 48], and scores of press articles have called for a more active role in non-aligned circles by Egypt and the need to reassess the policies of the second Sadat term within the current international milieu. Government officials have asserted that Egypt is not an ally but a friend of the United States [Ref. 56], and that the U.S. needs good friends and not allies in the region. The Egyptian officials reason that a strong (domestically and militarily) and influential Egypt that is a friend of the U.S. is far more stable than an allied Egypt, regionally and internationally isolated and ripe for internal strife.

There is a desire within Egyptian official circles and the educated elite for Egypt to regain the degree of

influence and leadership in the Arab world that they once enjoyed [Ref. 57]. As Egypt began to emerge from its relative isolation and regain its international credentials it also began to reassert its leadership role in the Arab world. At times this was done almost apologetically, as when Kamal Hassan Ali said in late 1982,

"Egypt does not want leadership, but our situation and our fate impose on us certain commitments which we carry out honestly and sincerely. Hence, the Egyptian role in supporting the Arab homeland as a whole. Events have proved this. Egypt has shouldered and continues to shoulder the battle for peace. Egypt [is qualified] to carry out a responsible role-- and I do not say a leadership role." [Ref. 58]

At other times Ali had called for close coordination between Saudi Arabia and Egypt since that will bring positive results on the region, and would combine the two most important states in the region [Ref. 59]. Ali's comments were a reply to a popular Egyptian view which states that Saudi Arabia has been halting progress in Egypt's return to the Arab world.

On the other hand, Safwat Al-Sharif the minister of state for information and long-time close friend of Mubarak reiterated a dominant and emerging feeling on Egypt's regional role when he highlighted major items in a Mubarak speech. According to the minister, Mubarak said,

"We give boundlessly for the sake of our Arab nation and the Palestinian cause. We may not be giving financial support, but, on the other hand, we have our culture and capabilities that place us at the forefront. That Egypt will remain the leading state in the region whether some like it or not." [Ref. 60]

It seems that the Egyptian leadership has been taking some advice from some of the former foreign ministry officials in formulating their foreign policy strategy. Ismail Fahmy who served Sadat as foreign minister for three years but resigned over the Jerusalem trip were among many who became very critical of Egyptian foreign policies during the summer of 1982. He, like many, linked Israeli actions in Lebanon to an overall American strategy in the region. He also saw Egypt's inability to influence events in its region as a consequence of its uneven relationship with the United States. He proposed the following course for the Egyptian leadership:

"To be effective Egypt must regain its strength and political power....A genuine Egypt should not just repeat slogans and indulge in rhetoric...Egypt is completely different from the Arab world in its ability, illumination and control of the course of events, and also in its power to maintain a constructive balance. Egypt is the only country in this strategic part of the world that can play the game of nations well. This is why Egypt must build complete bridges with the Arab world...[and] restore diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. Israel and the great powers would take account of an Egypt full of vitality and strength...[then] it will definitely be able to directly influence events in the region." [Ref. 61]

Egypt's more independent line with the United States, its reassertion of the nonaligned principles in its foreign policy and the return of the Soviet ambassador to Cairo should all be analyzed in Egypt's desire to serve its national interests first and foremost being security, immediately followed by economic conditions and the desire to restoring its freedom of movement. In the next chapter we will discuss Egypt's national security and its military relations under Mubarak.

VI. MILITARY RELATIONS

"It is indisputable that Egypt is the largest country in the Arab region, in North Africa and also in the western corner of Asia. Egypt's geographical location and its position in the balance of international powers are extremely sensitive. There is no doubt that nothing is being given to Egypt for Egypt's sake. Egypt is the significant ingredient that changes the balance in the scales because its strategic position in the region carries clout. On that basis Egypt may be courted; that is indisputable. Therefore, there has to be a relationship." [Ref. 1]

Egypt's military relationship with the United States can best be analyzed within Egypt's developing concept of its national security needs. Egypt has been committed to a strong defense capability which would facilitate the pursuit of its national interest in a sometime hostile, or non-permissive, environment. For the Egyptian elite, politics is indeed about power, and military force continues to be a central component of power.

Egypt's rising population (estimated at 47 million in 1984), at the rate of one million every 10 months, is a constant drain on Egypt's limited resources. Also the government's decision to maintain a large standing military force (approximately 450,000)* commensurate with the country's

*Breakdown in 1983, Army: 320,000; Air Defense Forces: 80,000; Air Force: 27,000; and Navy: 20,000. (Source: Aviation Week & Space Technology, 15 August 1983).

regional political leadership has meant Soviet military aid; while Sadat relied on the countries of the Arabian Peninsula to financially support his eastern and western arm purchases. After Camp David, Sadat could only rely on the United States and to a lesser extent on France to provide weapons and financing of his armed forces.

By switching from eastern bloc weapons, and all the doctrinal baggage involved, to western ones Sadat had to rely on the leader of that bloc, the United States. Due to the size of his armed forces and the quantities involved, only one of the superpowers could afford to resupply Egypt in the post-1973 war. Naturally some Western European countries like France, Italy, and Britain in addition to China and North Korea were willing to conduct gap-filling duties for the needs of the Egyptian military, but never in sufficient quantities. Sadat wanted the symbolism associated with establishing a military relationship with the United States. In 1976 the sale of six C-130 transport aircraft to Egypt broke a twenty-year arms sale embargo to Egypt. By the end of 1981, Egypt had received or contracted to receive medium battle tanks, armed personnel carriers, sophisticated fighter aircraft, and missiles from the United States. Sadat had succeeded in bringing the U.S. into a military relationship with Egypt.

This relationship has developed further under Mubarak and, like his predecessor, has included large joint exercises

codenamed -- Bright Star. These joint maneuvers were conducted in 1980, 1981, and 1983. In addition, a joint U.S. - Egyptian naval exercise "Sea Winds" involving major elements of the U.S. 6th fleet was conducted in early November 1984 [Ref. 2]. In one of the three phases of this exercise, the American aircraft carrier simulated an aggressor role with its organic assets while the Egyptian Air Defense Forces and the Air Force defended the homeland. A year earlier the Egyptian Navy had held joint maneuvers with the British Royal Navy.

Since Sadat's death, Egypt has received 40 advanced F-16 fighter aircraft [Ref. 3] and has another 40 (to include C/D versions) on order. An agreement in principal has been signed for a total of 150 of these General Dynamics aircraft. Egypt still maintains about 35 F-4E fighters delivered in 1979. Four Grumman E-2C airborne early warning aircraft are expected to enter the Egyptian Air Force between 1985-1987. The Egyptian army and Air Defense Forces have also been recipients of U.S. weapons. These include 1,100 armed personnel carriers, and over 439 M-60-A3 battle tanks. Twelve Improved Hawk surface-to-air missile batteries are expected in country by the end of 1984, with four additional batteries on order. Another air defense system expected before year's end is the "Skyguard" (dubbed 'Amun' in Egypt) using AIM-7M sparrow missiles and twin barrel 35mm antiaircraft guns. This system is expected to be operational by April 1985.

The United States constitutes the major arms supplier to Egypt. However, Cairo tried to diversify its arms sources as much as possible. At the end of 1979, then defense minister Kamal Hassan Ali stated that Egypt realizes the difficulty in logistics, maintenance, and training with such an arms diversification policy but that it was necessary in order not to repeat the post 1973 arms dependence experience [Ref. 4]. Within this context of diversifying arm suppliers, Egypt concluded the Mirage-2000 fighter/bomber deal with France in January of 1982. This deal had been initiated almost two years earlier under Sadat. Abu-Ghazalah, in an interview, had indicated his desire for U.S. military aid to Egypt to be increased. He added that what the U.S. gives Egypt is still limited and this is what prompted Egypt to conclude the Mirage deal with France [Ref. 5]. In the same vein, on Mubarak's first visit to Western Europe since assuming power, the Egyptian national press carried headlines of promised arm sales to Egypt from Italy to include torpedo boats, helicopters and air defense systems [Ref. 6]. The press had a duty to portray the new president's first trip abroad to be a success.

France has also provided about 45 Alpha-Jet aircraft as an advance jet trainer, some of these are ground support/strike configured. Egypt has been assembling 100% of the aircraft locally with some parts locally produced. Egypt expects to manufacture about 15% of the Mirage-2000. A similar production - assembly deal (85% local production) was consummated

with Brazil for the EMB-312 Tucano basic training aircraft. China has also provided the Egyptian Air Force with Chinese versions of Soviet Mig-19 and Mig-21 (F-6 and F-7), and these are also locally assembled in Egyptian factories. These measures have been a steady and conscious effort on the Defense ministry to bring advance western technology to the Egyptian military with the desire to have some civilian industrial fallout. Co-production has been Abu-Ghazalah's theme for several years now as he tries to modernize the military and establish an indigenous arms industry. [Ref. 7]

The Egyptian Navy had not received the same priority as the other services until recently. Britain, China, and Spain have all delivered surface units to the Navy over the past three years. China has added two more submarines to the Egyptian inventory. In addition the United States and Britain have provided some assistance to the ongoing Egyptian effort to increase the longevity of Soviet weapons in the service.

The second Cairo International Defense convention was held in November 1984 and included 380 international arms manufacturers belonging to 19 countries. Egypt participated with 15 of its national arms manufacturers. The aim is to break into the Arab and African markets and to find financial support in developing the Egyptian arms industry, this would provide Cairo a dependable foreign currency earner. [Ref. 8]

Concurrent with the arms convention, the third African military conference was held in Cairo. Twenty-two African

states including Egypt participated in the conference. It lasted three days and discussed African military thought and strategy, military needs and coordination to achieve common goals. The first such conference was held in October 1980 while the second was held in Cairo in May 1982 and included 12 states. [Ref. 9]

It should be evident from the above cursory description of Egyptian arms procurement and production desires that it is a massive financial, maintenance and training endeavor. Yet, the Egyptian leadership have continually advocated the diversification policy of procurement and the goal of absorbing as much western technology as the western powers will provide. Even the Egyptian Air Force Academy is changing its curricula along the lines of the U.S. Air Force Academy in its effort to switch from a Soviet to a western system and philosophy according to Abdel Hamid Hilmi, the EAF's commandant [Ref. 10]. The financial burden is massive and hence U.S. military aid -- about \$3.6 billion in Mubarak's first three years -- becomes a major source of financing.

The picture which emerges then is of a country with an active foreign policy strongly endorsing and adhering to non-aligned principles while costly modernizing its military forces. Egypt's regional role requires a strong and credible Egyptian military, to be achieved with emphasis on quality, not quantity, according to Abu-Ghazalah [Ref. 11]. To meet its military needs, Egypt has turned to the U.S., and at

times Sadat felt the U.S. could be more forthcoming [Ref. 12], also France and to lesser extent Britain, Italy with West Germany as a potential co-production partner. Its dealings with Romania, China and Yugoslavia have not been to acquire state-of-the-art equipment but those that are compatible with already existing eastern systems. This would increase these system's life acting as a gap-filler until the turnover to western arms and technology is completed by the early 1990s.

The experience gained by Egyptian military industries in reverse engineering and assembly of its Soviet weapon systems would make it attractive to other Third World states in providing them technical and maintenance services. In addition these could be potential buyers of the excess Egyptian-modified eastern bloc arms. Therefore, Egypt's weapon source diversification currently includes both eastern and western sources, however, in advanced technology and electronics the diversification is only within the western bloc. Egypt's long-term strategy places the west as the fundamental supplier of the most advanced systems while Egypt hopes to supplement its needs with local production from its arms industry [Ref. 13].

In the military field, we can then say that Egypt under Mubarak is maintaining a special relation with the United States. This is a direct extension of Sadat's policies and desires since 1974. It is interesting to note that when the mini-crisis of the Red Sea - Gulf of Suez mines occurred in

August 1984, that Mubarak first called on the United States for minehunting and sweeping services. These forces eventually included French, British and Italian minesweeping units. With regards to diversification of weapon suppliers, this policy also goes back to the Sadat era and the military leadership who wanted to cease relying on only one source for its armament and spare part needs.

The Egyptian leadership is trying to achieve its security needs within three fundamental principles. First, the need to pacify and resolve conflicts in the area in a manner that will prevent their exploitation by any power that could jeopardize its interests. Secondly, the need to possess the strength as a means to deter any power from seeking to threaten Egypt militarily, economically, or politically. Finally, the need to achieve Arab solidarity that will guarantee higher Arab interests and unify strategic vision. [Ref. 14]

Under the above canopy, we note Egypt's desire to keep the region out of the cold war arena as much as possible. To eliminate regional pacts and exes as they only serve to force a counterpact or alliance which may very well pit one superpower against the other. In order for the region to enjoy any type of stability, the countries in the area must come to terms with each other. Egypt has been advocating defense of the area by local forces and hence the United States is asked to arm the Arab countries to be able to carry out the defense of their homeland. The call for Arab solidarity would include

a unified security policy with the Egyptian armed forces acting as an Arab, and not only an Egyptian, deterrent force.

Keeping in mind Egypt's continued need to extract resources from its environment (regional and global) in order to meet its defense and development plans, we must consider to whom the above security strategy is aimed. The United States is one, while the other is Saudi Arabia and to a lesser extent the Gulf mini-states. On the global level the United States is the major arms producer and provides financial facilities, in addition to the leverage it is perceived to have over Israel -- the only serious security threat to Egypt in the area. On the regional level, Saudi Arabia could provide Egypt with what it lacks most -- financial capital. Mubarak has been making great efforts at rapprochement with Saudi Arabia, and has been keen on not fueling Saudi fear of any latent Egyptian regional hegemony.

Mubarak has put his economy as the primary problem facing his country [Ref. 15]. In order for him to deal with the economy and modernize his armed forces in a country whose population is increasing unabatedly, Mubarak needs stability -- domestic and regional. The United States could and has provided aid for both programs, economy and military, however, Mubarak is not willing to put all his eggs in one basket and has sought to tap the Saudis for aid by his reaffirmation of Egypt's Arabism in words and deeds.

Let us now examine some of the pressing military issues during the period under study involving Egypt and the United States and indirectly the states of the region and the Soviet Union. While we have concluded that there were no basic changes in the Egyptian military strategy since Sadat, it is important to note how the current leadership has handled some of the major issues and the impact of its role conception. Two basic issues will be addressed, the topic of granting facilities and the joint Bright Star exercises. Domestic reaction on these issues will illuminate the regime's available options in dealing on these sensitive issues. The realization of the interlocking and overlapping forces at the domestic, regional and global levels in such issues will further demonstrate the inherent conflicts to be resolved by the regime.

A. FACILITIES

In August of 1981, Sadat in an interview declared that the "era of the establishment of military bases in Egypt or other countries in the world has ended and that this a remnant of the old colonialist rule." [Ref. 16] This comment was made at a time when Egypt was offering the facilities at Ra's Banas naval and air base on the Red Sea for use by the United States. Sadat saw the American interest in the base and Egypt in a positive sense. This would further secure Egypt to the United States, their strategic view in the region and the world becomes identical. Sadat would be able to successfully

compete with Israel for American favors. Sadat later in the interview added that Egypt has more strategic importance than Israel, and that it also has the capacity to provide military assistance to any Arab country during an emergency situation -- something that Israel cannot do. Additionally, Sadat wanted the United States to rearm Egypt in order to defend itself and "protect Saudi Arabia if need be." [Ref. 16] In Sadat's strategy, Egypt would receive American arms at a speedier rate on the one hand by showing its willingness to defend the Gulf oil areas and the other by providing the U.S. facilities on the Red Sea. Rumors circulating in Egypt at the time related to how Sadat would not even mind joining NATO.

Sadat wanted to solve his internal economic problems, he had already lost Saudi Arabian and Kuwaiti support, and so the United States was his only hope. He also wanted to secure any threats to his country. The Peace Treaty with Israel was one way to secure Egypt's most powerful and historical adversary and a close relationship with the U.S. would add to that security on the eastern front. Regarding his western borders, Sadat never really seriously considered Libya a direct threat in the same sense as Israel, but one that can cause political unrest and not a military defeat. The Aden Friendship Treaty of 1981 between Libya, Ethiopia, and South Yemen did bother the Egyptian military due to the pressure it places on Sudan -- Egypt's ally and strategic depth, and the Soviet Union was

seen as the main instigator of the pact [Ref. 17]. By drawing closer to the U.S., Sadat hoped to minimize his external threats whether they be from the east, west or the south and also to receive the type and quantity of economic aid which only the United States could make available.

Back in early 1980 a few weeks after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, then Vice-president Mubarak made a trip to Washington to discuss weapon procurement, the Palestinian problem and to establish basic principles on Egyptian-American cooperation. The basic agreed upon principles for future cooperation were: first, the Arab states would defend themselves and that Egypt will come to the aid of those requesting assistance -- with the Gulf states at the forefront. Facilities would be provided to the U.S. if the need arose, these would be temporary, and conditional in nature and only for the defense of the Gulf and Arab interests and dependent on a request by the local governments. Secondly, Egypt does not desire an American military presence on her soil. Thirdly, Egypt with increased capabilities and training, will be able to meet all possibilities and the aid of other countries. These were the building blocks for subsequent negotiations on Ra's Banas. These facilities were to be used to redress the balance in the region following Afghanistan. [Ref. 18]

The government faced some domestic opposition in 1981 on the role of facilities. According to Mumtaz Nassar, the opposition leader in the People's Assembly, he does not see a

difference between bases and facilities. "Military facilities in the modern sense are merely mobile bases. Bases and facilities will involve us in problems of conflict between the two superpowers in our area...." He did not feel it necessary to bring the U.S. to the defense of the area "The security of Egypt and of the area can be achieved only by the hands of its own people....It is the sons of the area alone who can fill any security vacuum in the area." [Ref. 20]

Boutros-Ghali, in August of 1983, reiterated four conditions in order to offer temporary facilities for the United States [Ref. 2]]:

- (1) If any aggression takes place on an Arab country.
- (2) If this Arab country asks the help of the U.S.
- (3) If the U.S. agrees to the request.
- (4) Egypt has the right to offer or not offer any facilities for the U.S. troops to help that country.

One major difference between this policy and that espoused under Sadat is condition number four. This provides Egypt with more control over the facilities and troop movements. It also demonstrates that Mubarak does not share identical American strategic view in the region. Under Sadat, Egyptian and American regional analyses were quite similar, so much so that Sadat had not provided Egypt with the procedural mechanism to control the use of the facilities. None would be needed, was the conclusion, for if the U.S. perceives a threat, Egypt would also perceive the threat in similar terms.

One also notices how the current Egyptian leadership is emphasizing defense of the area by the local armies and minimizing the facilities argument. Kamal Hassan Ali explains, "The Gulf states are relying on themselves...[they] have asked the United States solely for arms, and not for intervention." [Ref. 22] In addition Egypt was put in an uncomfortable position due to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982. Abu-Ghazalah had expressed his views on bases and facilities in the region in an interview when he added, "How can the Arabs give the U.S. any facilities in the area when up to now it has no definite stand on the Palestinian problem....The Arabs may give the U.S. such facilities if it solves the Palestinian problem." [Ref. 23] In the Egyptian leadership's mind, in the wake of the Lebanon experience, it has become more costly to deal with the United States at the level that both had desired. Moreover, Ra's Banas and the whole facilities issue could be perceived by Egypt as enhanced bargaining power in its attempt to regain its regional stature by promoting a comprehensive solution to the Middle East problem with American help.

Let us examine how the more independent domestic press has perceived the differences between Sadat and Mubarak to be on the topic of the United States and military facilities. The popular Rose El-Youssef weekly suggests in an article in June of 1984 Sadat's likely responses to the escalating war in the Gulf and the threat to the oil facilities would have been

markedly different from Mubarak's. The article suggests that the U.S. would demand to project its Rapid Deployment Force to the region in order to halt Iranian activities; followed by Egypt placing its bases under American command as another means of facilitating the effort. Egypt would also suggest the other Arab countries to do the same for the U.S., and those that refuse shall be labeled agents of Moscow. Finally, Egypt should also provide forces to stop the Iranian threat. [Ref. 24]

Mubarak's efforts during this period on the other hand were praised by the magazine, "...Egypt tried to contain the problem and protect the region from foreign interference.... This is our national policy and of nonalignment which Mubarak has applied since his announcement of it when he assumed power, without clamor or fanfare." [Ref. 24:p. 21] One could argue that the article was unfair to Sadat and possibly did not depict him in the proper light. However, more important here is the perception expressed in the article and shared by much of the Egyptian elite and masses. We have already indicated that Mubarak has not changed much in the basic terms regarding facility usage. But due to other concurrent actions, within the nonaligned group, the Arab world and the elimination of personalized politics, Mubarak has appeared more nationalistic, not a puppet to either superpower and is perceived to have radically changed some of Sadat's policies in its military relations with the United States.

In a somewhat related topic, according to Abu-Ghazalah, on the eve of Sadat's assassination Egypt had a policy of not sending troops outside Egypt unless Sudan is subjected to a foreign invasion [Ref. 25]. The international Arab weekly Al-Majalla in May of 1983 indicated that the United States had wanted Egypt to send military experts to Chad to support the Habre regime. None were sent. The American side, the magazine claims, believed that had Sadat been alive he would have immediately dispatched his experts to Chad [Ref. 26].

B. JOINT EXERCISES

Egypt's military relations with the United States has also included joint military exercises. The first of these -- Bright Star -- was in November 1980 in the Egyptian desert. The second exercise shortly followed Sadat's assassination in November 1981. These had usually included not more than 1,500 U.S. troops, were conducted during daylight hours, and occurred in the fall to avoid the intense desert heat. The exercises were not conducted in 1982 due to the Lebanese situation, however, they were on again in August of 1983. This latest exercise involved more U.S. troops (approximately 5,500), was longer in duration, and was conducted during the hottest period of the year. Also, there was an increase in the aerial platforms used, and some night time exercises were held. [Ref. 27]

Mubarak and the Egyptian leadership have taken great pain in assuring their neighbors that these exercises are not

designed against any state in particular [Ref. 28]. On another occasion Mubarak said, "We are a small country and we benefit from extensive and varied experiences of the U.S. Army. Such maneuvers benefit all of us. They have benefited and they have admitted this and so did we...." [Ref. 29] Kamal Hassan Ali has also voiced his support of these exercises since they increase the knowledge and efficiency of the Egyptian unit commanders [Ref. 30].

The Egyptian military since 1967 had been working on improving its moral, feeling that with modern equipment and intensive training, the Egyptian military can regain confidence [Ref. 31]. These joint exercises also serve along that continuous goal. Abu-Ghazalah, following the second joint exercise in 1981 summed up Egypt's benefits as follows [Ref. 32]:

- (1) Egyptian forces' ability to cooperate with the forces of another state has been established. Hence cooperation with friendly Arab armies will not be a problem.
- (2) The Egyptian soldier has become confident that his efficiency is equal to the U.S. soldier.
- (3) The Egyptian soldier now has great confidence in the weapons he is using after comparing it with his American counterpart.
- (4) The Egyptian forces have become confident in their combat capability and their potential for excellent planning and implementation.

These are concrete and tangible benefits which the Egyptian military leadership hopes to continue to gain from these exercises.

In a column in Ashara Al-Awsat, pertinent comments of an analysis of U.S. - Egyptian exercises by Zbigniew Brzezinski were printed. He is quoted to have forwarded three lessons on the U.S. - Egyptian relations in view of the exercises. First, there is a large storage of Egyptian nationalism and an acute sensitivity to any foreign military presence on Egyptian soil which may be construed to be permanent. Secondly, the U.S. should not believe that its interests and Egypt's national interests to be toally identical, and therefore the U.S. will make a grave error if it deals with Egypt as an American state. Finally and more importantly, he says that any alliance between the U.S. and any Arab regime will not be permanent or solid and will not have popular legitimacy as long as the Palestinian problem remains unresolved.

[Ref. 33]

These joint military maneuvers came under great criticism by the opposition in the press. Their rejection of the exercises was generally based on U.S. ties with Israel who the opposition feel is a more direct threat to Egyptian security and the Arab world than the Soviet Union, and a feeling of having a dependency on or being a lackey of the United States [Ref. 34]. Others attacked Egypt's declared peace strategy since it was not tied to American global strategy [Ref. 35]. The current regime was accused of allowing Egyptian territory to be a proving round for U.S. weapons, and a launchpad for interference in the affairs of the Arab and

Islamic countries [Ref. 36]. Some went so far as to accuse the government of being naive for allowing the U.S. to exploit it; Egypt needs a policy independent of Washington, they asserted [Ref. 37]. "President Mubarak's pledge that Egypt would never be a part of any superpower strategy is still a wish divorced from reality," [Ref. 37] claimed the opposition press.

By the end of July 1984, the Egyptian Navy had accepted 15 new units into the service that year [Ref. 11], and were expecting more by year's end. This is part of a program to modernize and increase the capabilities of the Navy and would be a first step along the road to making the Red Sea an Arab lake [Ref. 5]. The Egyptian Navy had held joint exercises with the British Royal Navy and the latest one "Sea Winds" was with the U.S. 6th fleet which also involved Egyptian Air Defense Forces. These exercises were strongly supported by the respective Egyptian military services [Ref. 2]. Also, the manner in which the announcement was made, at a military ceremony commemorating the Egyptian Navy, a week in advance would indicate that the leadership truly believes these exercises to be beneficial to Egypt and worth the domestic and regional opposition it will attract. Some were surprised about "Sea Winds" since the "Bright Star" exercises were not held in 1984, and expected these joint exercises to disappear. Opposition to the latest exercise did come from the popular Ashara Al-Awsat editorial board [Ref. 38].

Egypt's military relationship under Mubarak has not deviated in its basic structure. Egypt and the west, especially the U.S., do enjoy a "special" military relationship. Mubarak has provided more sovereign control over use of the country's facilities while emphasizing defense of the region by the Arab military, without foreign interference. In the quest to modernize the military and maintain a high level of moral and readiness, the leadership has looked with favor to the United States and its capabilities in order to achieve these goals. In a press article, Dr. Mohamed Ismail Ali presents some advice to the government, he suggests keeping foreign policy along the straight path, because "results of polarization to the left were clear on 5 June [1967], while results of polarization to the right were clear on 5 September [1981]." [Ref. 39]

VII. ECONOMIC AND TRADE RELATIONS

The internal domestic front has been the pressing issue in Egypt, certainly since Mubarak's assumption of power, with the economy being its Achilles' heel. The population is increasing at a faster than desired rate -- 2.8% annually [Ref. 1], or one million new additions every ten months, reaching 47 million inhabitants on only 4% of the land in 1984. Meanwhile agricultural production is growing at an annual rate of only 2% [Ref. 2]. Estimates of Egypt's foreign debts range from the World Bank's \$17,300 million to the Bank of International Settlements' \$21,800 million. Total government subsidies at present, cost the government an estimated \$7,000 million a year [Ref. 3]. By Third World standards, Egypt's economic problems are not severe and could be rectified, but with some hard and politically unpopular decisions [Ref. 4]. At least until that stage is reached, Egypt will continue to depend on external capital injections to its economy, whether it be Arab, western, eastern, or a combination thereof.

So how does the current leadership's actions in the realm of economic and trade compare with the Sadat regime, as they reflect foreign policy orientations? We will present in this chapter the economic trends observed during the past three years and any deviations from the prior policies. A brief

outline of Egypt's economic woes shall suffice to present the reader with the existing constraints on external political choices of Mubarak or any future heir in the near future. Both the prime minister [Ref. 5] and the foreign minister [Ref. 6] have given economic development precedence in political decisions.

Mubarak has not made any fundamental changes to Sadat's economic policy -- the Open Door -- of 1974 (Law 43). This economic liberalization plan which envisioned Egyptian labor + western technology + Arab capital producing economic prosperity came under domestic attack by the end of the seventies and before Sadat's assassination [Ref. 7]. Sadat had escalated popular expectations of prosperity as a result of peace with Israel and the virtual alliance with the United States. Unrestricted consumerism of the seventies brought a new class of "Fat Cats" with dubious social values and a general sense that the burdens of the time are now shared more unequally than ever before. Overnight millionaires became heroes to emulate, regardless of how unscrupulous were the means.

The increasing religiosity during this time could be explained in part as a reaction to the newly developing social conditions in Egypt. The ties to the United States came under great criticism by nationalists, leftists, and religious groupings. It was over such conditions that Mubarak found himself presiding in October of 1981. He opted not to change

the Economic Open Door Policy (EODP) but to redirect it and change it from a consumer oriented EODP to a production oriented one. In addition, a five-year economic plan was drawn to guide future investments and provide tangible goals to articulated economic concepts; the rolling yearly budgets and plans of the late seventies would no longer suffice.

Mubarak could not afford to dismantle his predecessor's economic apparatus, had he wanted to. He saw the plan to be basically sound but needs to be more in step with the national goals. In Mubarak's first cabinet of 4 January 1982, the deputy prime minister for economic affairs, Ali Abdel-Rassaz Abdel-Meguid, was replaced by Abdel-Fattah Ibrahim. The former deputy prime minister had come under a series of criticism in the summer of 1981 for a series of haphazardly introduced economic measures. The timing of the cabinet reshuffle seemed also to coincide with the ongoing corruption case against businessman Rashad Osman, in which Abdel-Meguid's name was mentioned in court. Also brought into the economic team were Mohamed Salaheddin Hamed, minister of Finance and Kamal Ahmed El-Ganzouri, minister of Planning.

In September of 1982 another cabinet reshuffle was taken, confirming the notion that the earlier January reshuffle was a stop-gam measure. Hamed, and El-Ganzouri retained their portfolios with newcomers being: Moustapha Kamel Said, minister of Economy and Foreign Trade; and Wagih Shindi as minister of Investment and International Co-operation who

replaced Abdel Fattah Ibrahim. This cabinet lasted nearly two years -- indicating Mubarak's stress on stability -- until July of 1984, following the May legislature elections. Wagih Shindi was shifted to Tourism and Civil Aviation; the Investment Affairs ministry was disbanded, and the Investment Authority brought under the aegis of the Planning ministry. Hence, El-Ganzouri's role in the economic team has been greatly elevated given Mubarak's emphasis on planning and foreign investment. Additionally, the newly formed higher investment committee headed by Prime Minister Kamal Hassan Ali, has announced new procedures designed to streamline investment. The Investment Authority has been empowered to give provisional approval for a project the same day it is submitted, with final approval within 60 days. In theory the reorganizations should speed up and facilitate foreign investment, a key Mubarak goal, however time will tell.

Key entires of Egypt's current budget appears in Table 1 to help elucidate the country's current economic situation. Direct subsidies loom large in the budget representing 16% of the total revenues. When indirect subsidies (energy subsidies) are taken into account, the total subsidy bill becomes nearly 39% of the country's total revenues. These subsidies offset the hard currency income provided from worker's remittances and oil sales. Mubarak's economic team hopes to reduce the percentage of subsidies as they relate to the gross domestic product (GPD). Growth is put at about

7.5% a year while the rate of inflation is estimated between 15-20%.

Oil revenues represent less than 10% of total revenues in Egypt, this is despite production of nearly one million barrels a day. Of the expected production of 45 million tons in 1984/85, approximately half will be consumed locally at a greatly subsidized price. The net Suez Canal revenues in the current budget represent a decline over 1983/84. This only represents over two percent of the country's revenue. However, Suez Canal dues do provide badly needed hard currency for the government which are reflected in its current account.

The average annual growth in imports between 1972-1981 was 43.1% while the average annual growth in exports was 26% in the same period. If we do not include oil revenues, the exports growth percentage would shrink to 11.2% [Ref. 8]. Additionally, in December 1974 the domestic debt stood at 4,595 million Egyptian pounds. By June 1983 it had risen to 19,179 million pounds [Ref. 9]. In 1982 Egypt's trade balance (exports less imports) was a negative 3,212 million pounds. The trade deficit in 1983 is estimated to be at 3,278 million pounds [Ref. 10]. Worker's remittances have increased from 1,452 million pounds in 1982 to an estimated 2,309 million pounds in 1983. This was mainly due to the government's conscious efforts to attract this income with favorable banking conditions.

TABLE 1

Egyptian Budgets, 1983/84 - 1984/85
(in millions of Egyptian Pounds)*

	1984/85	1983/84	% change
Total expenditure:	18,277	16,232	+ 12.8
Direct subsidies	2,058	1,686	+ 22.1
Investment	4,865	4,400	+ 10.7
Health & Education	2,033	1,696	+ 19.9
Public Sector wages	3,295	2,935	+ 12.3
Foreign debt service	231	208	+ 11.1
Domestic debt service	1,236	1,028	+ 20.2
Military	2,397	2,133	+ 12.4
Total Revenues	12,877	11,219	+ 14.8
Sovereign Tax	7,646	6,916	+ 10.6
Net oil	1,230	1,017	+ 20.9
Net Suez Canal	286	323	- 11.5
Other non-tax	2,375	1,730	+ 20.9
Investment transfers	1,339	1,233	+ 8.6
Gross deficit	5,400	5,012	+ 7.7
Domestic Savings & Foreign credits	4,200	3,712	+ 13.1
Net deficit	1,200	1,300	- 7.7

*Government accounts are calculated at the rate of \$1=0.70 Egyptian pounds.

Source: Al-Ahram Al-Igtisadi, pp. 76, 77, 19 November 1984.

It should be evident that the government of Egypt, regardless of who occupies the top governmental position, is in dire need of large external injections of financial aid. This picture shall not change much unless the policymakers are willing and able to make the difficult and unpopular choices in its yearly budget. This would require a truly popular and elected government with broad base support, and a sense of belonging with a unity of purpose by the populace. Mubarak had hoped to gain such a mandate by the May Parliamentary elections, however only one opposition party, the New Wafd, gained entry with 58 seats out of a total 448 election seats. His attempt to reduce subsidies in September 1984 in the midst of a heavy governmental campaign to educate the masses about subsidies caused some riots in Kafr El-Dawar near Alexandria; the prices were subsequently reduced [Ref. 11]. Instead Mubarak and his economic team have been pushing for increased productivity and increasing exports [Ref. 12] by aggressive marketing and improved packaging among other things. The other side of the coin is to attract foreign investments [Ref. 13]. The domestically difficult decisions will be deferred to a later period, and so the Egyptian leadership looks to its external environment for easier decisions.

Egypt receives yearly about one billion dollars in economic aid from the United States. This has usually been divided between Economic Support Fund (ESF), designed for those countries of strategic importance, and the PL-480 food program.

The U.S. agency for International Development (USAID) has a large presence in Cairo as it disburses and manages the aid. Other sources of aid have included Western European countries and Japan but not on the same scale as the U.S. inputs or presence. International organizations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) have also provided needed capital with the former providing since 1970 about \$3.8 billion in loans [Ref. 14].

We shall examine the available data on economic trade between Egypt and the world [Ref. 15] between 1980 and 1983 to compare the last two years of Sadat with the first two years of Mubarak. This should provide us with a tool to gauge Egypt's economic and trade relations and if they have been changed by the new regime. We are not attempting though to assign Mubarak a western or eastern orientation in foreign policy by the trade patterns but only to evaluate them within our original question of continuity or change with previous policy.

In 1980 Egypt's volume of bilateral trade with the Soviet Union was \$204.5 million and \$362.2 million in 1981, according to IMF data. The volume in 1982 and 1983 under Mubarak were \$311.0 million and \$308.2 million, respectively. When Eastern Europe is added (to include Romania, Hungary and Yugoslavia) the figures for 1980 and 1981 become \$956.9 million and \$1,312.4 million, respectively. Under Mubarak,

the volume of trade then becomes \$1,343.4 million and \$1,319.8 million for 1982 and 1983, respectively. [Ref. 15: p. 151]

As a percentage of Egypt's exports and imports during those same four years we will actually notice a decline in eastern block nation's trading share with Egypt. On the export side in 1980 the share was 13.6% and 10.5% in 1981. This increased to 14.9% in 1982 and back down to 11.2% in 1983. With regards to imports, the percentages become 11.1, 10.8, 9.7, and 6.1 for the successive years, showing a continuing decline. Of interest is how prominent Romania and Yugoslavia figure as trading partners with Egypt before and after Sadat's assassination. Between 1980 and 1983, the volume of bilateral trade with Romania was actually larger than with the Soviet Union. [Ref. 15:p. 151]

If the Soviet Union and eastern bloc nations capture this small share of Egypt's trade, then with whom is the bulk of the remaining trade conducted. The bloc of industrialized countries including the U.S., Canada, Western Europe and Japan capture most of Egypt's trade. In 1980 and 1981 average share of exports to that bloc was 55.7% with the average import share being 70.6%. The succeeding years of 1982 and 1983 the average exports figure was 62.9% while imports stood at 75%. So we note how these industrialized countries have increased their share of Egypt's trade under Mubarak's presidency. [Ref. 15:p. 151]

Let us now shift to some of the economic decisions undertaken in the past three years and how they impacted on Egypt's relations with the superpowers and their respective blocs. Two months after assuming power, Mubarak, lifted a ban on Egyptian cotton exports to the eastern bloc imposed by Sadat a few weeks before his assassination [Ref. 16]. This was one of the first indications that the new Egyptian leadership wished to separate economic policies from international politics of which Kamal Hassan Ali is a strong advocate. A similar decision in March of 1982 was the approval to buy newsprint from the Soviet Union and East Germany, these imports had been frozen in 1981. Additionally, Mubarak had earlier requested from the Soviet Union the return of some 66 industrial advisors to maintain some of the Soviet-supplied factories under warranty in Egypt.

Relations with the Soviet Union improved further with the signing on 26 May 1983 of the first bilateral trade agreement since 1977. This agreement made arrangements for repayment of Egyptian debts owed to the Soviet Union which were stopped by presidential decree. Egypt's exports will be approximately 35 million Egyptian pounds over the amount it imports from the Soviet Union, this differential will be considered installments toward full debt repayment. Up to this point there had been disputes between the Egyptian and the Soviet governments over the amount of debt and the level of yearly installments to be paid. [Ref. 17]

A second trade protocol was signed in Cairo on 1 December 1983 by visiting Soviet deputy foreign trade minister, Ivan Grishin. This new trade protocol for 1984 aimed at increasing the volume of trade exchange between the two countries by 25% to an estimated 500 million Egyptian pounds. As a result of these agreements, the volume of bilateral trade will increase dramatically over the previous years, if they are carried out in full. The Soviet Union will then absorb about 90% of Egypt's exports of furniture, perfume, and cosmetics, 80% of its exports of perfume oils, and 50% of its cotton yarn exports in addition to cloth, citrus, onions, and garlic [Ref. 18]. Egypt's imports from the Soviet Union will include 40% of its needs for coal, frozen fish, and cardboard, and 46% of its wood; in addition to equipment, machinery and spare parts [Ref. 18].

There has also been a concurrent improved trading environment with Eastern European states. Many Egyptian economic experts [Ref. 18:p. 4-6] regard the U.S. marketplace as too competitive for Egyptian manufactured goods. The principal markets for their industrial production, is felt to be, in the countries of the socialist camp and the Third World. While not advocating a return to economic trade with only one bloc, they are emphasizing the need to aggressively seek markets suitable for Egyptian manufactured goods. It is widely expected, though not publicly, in Egyptian circles that the exchange of ambassadors with the Soviet Union will improve

trade and economic relations between Egypt and the eastern bloc states. Some reports of expected facilitations in trade have already circulated [Ref. 19].

Trade with Romania has been strong even under Sadat with the Romanian President and Sadat being close friends, however it is developing further under Mubarak. The volume of trade between Cairo and Bucharest was estimated at \$420 million in mid-1982 by Egyptian sources, and was expected to reach \$1 billion by 1985 [Ref. 20]. An economic protocol was signed with Romania in May 1983. In 1984, Romania agreed to build a cement factory near Asyut with a 2 million ton capacity when completed (1986-1987) at a cost of \$277 million [Ref. 21]. Electricity projects were also earmarked by Romania for soft loans [Ref. 22], as were steelworks [Ref. 23]. A tank deal was consummated in January of 1984 with Egypt for the eventual purchaser, Iraq [Ref. 24].

Czechoslovakia is another country with which Egypt expects to improve its trade balance. In 1983 Egypt imported three times as much as it exported to Prague [Ref. 15]. In late 1982, Egypt was reported to have received some equipment from Czechoslovakia for its heavy artillery plants; these were ordered three years earlier [Ref. 25]. The final delivery of this equipment indicate the thaw in relations in the post-Sadat period. An economic and technical cooperation agreement was signed by both countries on 30 May 1984, with hope to improve on the \$170 million in bilateral trade reached

in 1983 [Ref. 26]. Czechoslovakia had indicated its willingness to join in the development of the Egyptian petrochemical industry as well as in the energy industry, agriculture, and textile industry [Ref. 27].

Trade relations with Hungary have been increasing but from a lower base. A protocol of economic and trade cooperation was signed early in 1982 [Ref. 28]. It provided for \$50 million in credit facilities to finance 85% of their joint ventures, to be repaid over six to ten years. The ventures would be in agriculture, irrigation, electricity, and transportation fields. At the end of 1983, Budapest was to build 120 train carriages [Ref. 29]. Hungary has been eager to increase its volume of trade with Egypt as evidenced by a special 24-page supplement in the Egyptian economic journal Al-Ahram Al-Igtisadi (19 November 1984). This also served to advertise "a week of Hungarian business, technology, and culture" held in Cairo the end of the year. Earlier in the year, Mubarak had met with Hungary's agriculture and food minister Vancsa to obtain more help for farming and land reclamation projects [Ref. 30], indicating Egypt's increased emphasis on the agricultural sector.

The German Democratic Republic has not been prominent in Egypt's trade patterns. It has provided in 1982, \$133 million for rural electrification and network renewal in 47 towns [Ref. 31]. Overall relations with Bulgaria have been strained for several years and it was not until 1984 that any

improvements were noted. A Bulgarian trade team arrived in Cairo to stimulate economic cooperation; a trade agreement was signed on 20 January 1984 [Ref. 32]. The Egyptian government's trade center in Sofia, which was closed in 1977, was finally reopened in September of 1984 [Ref. 33].

Between July 1983 and July 1984, according to selected contracts reported in Middle East Economic Digest [Ref. 2: pp. 38-44], Egypt signed 144 deals, the eastern bloc states acquired 11 of these contracts or 7.6%. These numbers will probably increase in the future as Egypt continues to normalize its relations with these countries in search of export markets and credit facilities.

Egypt's economic needs dictate on the leadership to isolate economic and trade policies from adverse political repercussions. To minimize any adverse conditions, Mubarak has sought to foster and project a calm and stable domestic environment and a steady, at times dull, foreign policy lacking the "electric shocks" or "solid blows" of his predecessors. Egypt must continue to maximize its external resources as long as it continues on the current economic course. It is estimated that Egypt received \$12.68 billion worth of aid from the U.S. and Socialist countries between 1954-1980 [Ref. 34]. Since then, U.S. economic and military loans and grants have averaged about \$2 billion a year.

Mubarak has embarked on a course to redirect the EODP to a production orientation to curb excessive consumerism, has

called for increased productivity and quality in manufacturing to better Egyptian goods. The Arab world, Africa and the Socialist countries are projected to be the prime export markets for its manufactured and semi-finished goods. However, Egypt's economic links with the west, regardless of the criticism they receive at times in the domestic press [Ref. 35], are a very real necessity to meet its development goals, and above all to feed a growing population. The centrality of the economy in Egypt's policies is reflected by Esmat Abdel Meguid, the foreign minister, who has elevated his "diplomacy of development" to become the driving force for his ministry. It would become an effective way of achieving Egypt's economic, and technical development plan [Ref. 36].

VIII. CONCLUSION

"World politics are very complex and one should not be so sensitive about everything....It is a game of interests...we should look after our interests even with the devil." [Ref. 1]

Egypt's geostrategic position, and historical regional role have conditioned the attitudes and actions of its people and leaders throughout history. Its large homogeneous population has, simultaneously been a strategic asset and an economic burden. Successive regimes have now had to deal with the dilemmas of aid/independence, resources/objectives, and security/development.

These regimes operated at different stages of Egyptian and Third World economic and diplomatic development. The international system had also undergone some major changes over the past 35 years. The conditions providing the context in each stage have been different. Nasser and most Egyptians in 1952 were preoccupied with gaining British evacuation following decades of heavy British dependence. For Sadat in 1970 his starting point was a heavy dependence on the Soviet Union and occupied Egyptian land. Mubarak's starting point was marked with the violent assassination of Sadat, by his side, and heavy dependence on the United States. When asked about whose style and policies he favors, Sadat or Nasser, Mubarak has always been quick to reply that each had his own era and situation and his period is different, adding that his name is Hosni Mubarak.

Nasser's foreign policy was not fully articulated until the tumultuous years of 1955-56 after a series of tragic misunderstandings and distrust with the west. Sadat's own policies and their consequences did not materialize for several years after he assumed power. Both had reacted to the exigencies and embarked on a series of decisions to correct the wrongs they perceived, and in a manner each felt would be popular. Mubarak has been at the helm slightly more than three years; by then Nasser had been to Bandung and Sadat had celebrated the Crossing. Mubarak's Bandung or Crossing are no where on the horizon. Instead, domestically he has a long neglected economy that is more in need of a blood transfusion than band-aids, while regionally and internationally he has the elusive comprehensive Arab-Israeli peace and an achievable leading role in the nonaligned movement.

Mubarak has delivered on the nonaligned movement and Egypt has regained much of the international stature it had lost during Sadat's last years. However, domestically this has only bought him more time until he can provide a real miracle as his predecessors had done. In Egypt the presidency comes with a very heavy burden, its occupant becomes a near deity -- a Pharaoh -- and must perform as one. Form had overtaken substance years ago and a few waves of the leader's magic wand was sufficient to awe even the great worldly powers.

Mubarak, from the beginning, had to distance his regime from the United States. This was the natural reaction to Egypt's immediate past experience with the heavy dependence on the United States. Reassertion of nonaligned principles, in word and deed, served this well. However, this was tempered by his immediate security needs -- external and internal, and the services the United States could provide during the tense few weeks following the assassination.

Concomitantly, passive measures were initiated to mend fences with the Arab world, specifically Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states. Also, peace with Israel had to be maintained in order to regain and keep the Sinai and in order to meet his formidable internal challenge -- the economy. For these objectives Mubarak had to maintain Egypt's relationship with the United States, but with varying degree of closeness, simultaneously. Following the invasion of Lebanon in 1982, Mubarak's balance beam with the United States had become a tight wire. Egypt's massive economic needs and current policies make the west in general and the United States in particular best suited and able to provide the help.

As Egypt attempts to modernize its factories, agriculture, and inject western technology and equipment into its military forces, it realizes the benefits that could be accrued from its relationship with the United States. Arab financial assistance could not replace the expertise and technology associated with the current western aid. Therefore, Mubarak

Mubarak has also removed several politicians which were prominent under his predecessor and had been targets of opposition. He has allowed much criticism of government policies without taking adverse measures, for he had seen their eventual effect. With democracy, albeit controlled, and open dialogue, Mubarak hopes to gain at a minimum the needed stability for economic growth and eventually the support for any possible unpopular but needed economic reforms.

Despite Egypt's economic woes, they are probably easier to deal with and hold a greater certainty for reform than to find a just and lasting peace to the Palestinian problem -- Mubarak's other Herculean task. Of these two basic issues facing the regime, the economy is the more dangerous since it directly affects millions of Egyptians every single day of their life. There is a dilemma in reforming the economy, for if subsidies are removed as have been called for by the IMF and Egyptian economists, then the regime would face riots similar to or greater than the January 1977 or Kafr El-Dawar ones. These would reveal the weakness of the regime, something no ruler wishes to face. Therefore, political considerations negate sound economic application even if it is in the country's long-term benefit. So until Mubarak or his successor is forced to or has enough political strength to undertake these structural reforms in the economy, Egypt will continue to depend on external aid.

The United States looms large in supporting Egypt's economy and hence its regime, and also in finding a solution to the Palestinian problem. Within the international system, the only state which has exercisable influence over Israel, the party on the ground, is the United States. Therefore, it can serve to provide Mubarak with the means to achieve either or both of the tasks ahead of him. At the same time, as we mentioned earlier, Mubarak had to distance himself from the actions of the United States. Also when he tried to apply influence on Israel in Lebanon directly or through the United States he discovered how little influence he had and/or how little influence his senior partner could exercise with his neighbor to the east. In addition, Israel's activity in Lebanon and the tragedies of September 1982, turned any future asset Cairo had placed on its ties with Israel to a real liability.

Mubarak's reaction was to continue Egypt's return to the Arab fold but now with much greater emphasis on the political influence a united Arab strategy would have. The American ties were to be maintained in order to meet Egypt's economic and military requirements. The key to solving the Palestinian problem switches from Washington to the Arab capitals. Mubarak and the Egyptian leadership see Arab disunity as the reason for the United States not restraining Israel and enforcing or seriously backing the autonomy talks and later the Reagan plan. In other words, the United States will not act on its

own unless it is pressured. In 1973, it was the October War that provided that impetus for action, in the 1980s that option is no longer valid and Egypt does not wish for it to become attractive. Therefore, a peace strategy will be sought with Amman and a moderate PLO and behind the scene support from Riyadh, which was beginning to manifest itself at the close of 1984. Still the United States has a definite role to play even in this strategy.

The key here is that Egypt has not actively sought to distance itself from the United States or recall its ambassador from Tel Aviv. Egypt has been reacting to events beyond its control, it is discovering how much its regional influence had deteriorated since 1973. In order to meet its national interest, Egypt will continue to nurture strong ties with the United States while sometimes being openly critical of its Middle Eastern policy. The only real Egyptian initiative was immediately following Sadat's death with Mubarak claiming nonaligned policies as a guide to Egypt's foreign policy. This provided more room to maneuver and theoretically increasing available policy options for the regime. Despite this, Mubarak has not taken Egypt for another swing of the pendulum, he seems to have for now settled in the middle. He once said his hobby was reading Egyptian history, Mubarak must have retained some valuable lessons.

Continuity or change? We think that question has been resolved by the above analysis. With regards to style, the

two men are diametrically opposed. The conditons under which the presidency was assumed demanded some changes be taken. Subsequent events at the regional level again caused some shifts. Yet, Egypt continues to maintain a "special" relationship with one superpower and normalized relations with the other, calling it balanced relations. It has made the use of its facilities by the United States more stringent, but has not withdrawn the offer. It has withdrawn its ambassador from Israel but continues to uphold the peace treaty. It has taken a more active role in the Arab world and is slowly being accepted back. Sadat had not chosen to politically isolate Egypt from the Arab world, that was imposed on him. Mubarak later discovered that Egypt was not "great" without the Arab world, but that both were in need of each other.

If continuity means Egypt and the United States analyze regional and global developments identically, then the answer is a profound no. If change means the Soviet Union will have an exclusive economic or military relationship with Cairo, then again no. There have been some shifts and adjustments but nothing drastic had occurred, it simply would not be in Mubarak's cautious style. Future Egyptian orientation and foreign policy direction will depend greatly on Mubarak's domestic position, Israel's regional activity -- in Lebanon and the occupied territories, progress on the peace process, and the conduct of U.S. foreign policy in the region.

LIST OF REFERENCES

CHAPTER II. A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS

1. Korany, B., "Foreign Policy Models and their Empirical Relevance to Third World Actors: A Critique and an Alternative," International Social Science Journal, v. 26, pp. 70-94, March 1974.
2. Brecher, M., and others, The Foreign Policy System of Israel, p. 11, Oxford University Press, 1972.
3. Dessouki, A. H., and Korany, B., The Foreign Policies of Arab States, Westview Press, 1984.
4. Holsti, K. J., International Politics: A Framework for Analysis, 4th ed., pp. 97-121, Prentice-Hall, 1983.

CHAPTER III. ROLE CONCEPTION

1. Abdul-Nasser, G., Egypt's Liberation: The Philosophy of the Revolution, pp. 87-88, Public Affairs Press, 1955.
2. Boutros-Ghali, B., "The Foreign Policy of Egypt in the Post-Sadat Era," Foreign Affairs, v. 60 (4), p. 769, Spring, 1982.
3. Heikal, M. H., "Egyptian Foreign Policy," Foreign Affairs, v. 57 (1), pp. 714-727, July 1978.
4. Boutros-Ghali, B., "The Foreign Policy of Egypt," in Foreign Policies in a World of Change, p. 348, Harper & Row, 1963.
5. Collection of Speeches and Declarations of President Gamal Abdul Nasser, Part 1, p. 46, State Information Service, Cairo.
6. Holsti, K. J., International Politics, 4th ed., p. 104, Prentice-Hall, 1983.
7. Little, T., Egypt, Praeger, 1958.
8. El-Sadat, A., In Search of Identity, pp. 204-231, Harper & Row, 1977.
9. Al-Hakim, T., 'Awdat Al-Wai', Beirut, 1974.

10. The October Working Paper Presented by President Mohamed Anwar El-Sadat, State Information Service, Cairo.
11. Times, p. 19, 2 January 1978.
12. Dessouki, A. H., "The Foreign Policy of Egypt," in The Foreign Policies of Arab States, Dessouki and Korany (eds.), p. 129, Westview, 1984.
13. Dessouki, A. H. (ed.), National Independence, pp. 13-37, Cairo, 1982.
14. Rose El-Youssef, 24 March 1975.
15. Korany, B., "The Difficult Balance in Egypt's Foreign Policy," Al-Siyasah Al-Duwaliyah, v. 18, p. 137, July 1982.
16. ABC News Transcript of 'Barbara Walters' interview with Prime Minister Begin of Israel and President Sadat of Egypt, November 20, 1977, p. 9.
17. Weizman, E., The Battle for Peace, pp. 88-89, Bantam Books, 1981.
18. Sunday Times, 14 January 1973.
19. Al-Ahram, 17 September 1981.
20. Heikal, M., Autumn of Fury: The Assassination of Sadat, Random House, 1983.
21. Al-Muwafi, A. H., Egypt in the Arab League: A Study in the Role of the Great Powers in Regional Organizations (1945-1970), pp. 378-380, Cairo, 1983.
22. Mayo, p. 5, 5 October 1981.
23. Al-Akhbar, 20 August 1981.
24. Jeune Afrique, pp. 54-55, 7 April 1982.
25. Foreign Broadcast Information Service - Middle East and Africa (FBIS-MEA), "Official Statements of Nonaligned Anniversary," p. D1, 1 September 1981.
26. Al-Majalla, p. 14, 2 September 1983.
27. Al-Majalla, p. 10, 3 November 1984.

CHAPTER IV. POLITICO-DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS
WITH THE UNITED STATES

1. Mayo, pp. 3,5, 19 October 1981.
2. Saliba, N. E., "The Decline Nasirism in Sadat's Egypt," World Affairs, v. 138, pp. 51-59, Summer 1975.
3. Al-Moukif Al-Arabi, p. 23, 28 March - 3 April 1983.
4. Ibrahim, S. E., "The Fight over Mubarak's Soul," Journal of Arab Affairs, v. 2, p. 85, October 1982.
5. Al-Ahram, p. 6, 9 October 1981.
6. New York Times, p. A8, 20 October 1981.
7. FBIS-MEA, "Ghali on Foreign Relations," p. D10, 21 October 1981.
8. FBIS-MEA, "Ghali Affirms Goal of Middle East Peace," p. D1, 22 October 1981.
9. Boutros-Ghali, B., "The Foreign Policy of Egypt," in Foreign Policies in a World of Change, pp. 341-347, Harper & Row, 1963.
10. Al-Majalla, p. 14, 27 August - 2 September 1984.
11. Monday Morning, pp. 48, 49, 19-25 October 1981.
12. "Interview with President Mubarak," October, 1 November 1981.
13. Akhbar Al-Yawm, p. 8, 14 November 1981.
14. Al-Akhbar, p. 4, 10 August 1981; p. 7, 3 May 1981; p. 6, 12 June 1981; p. 7, 3 May 1981; p. 3, 10 May 1981; and Al-Ahram, p. 5, 15 September 1981; p. 5, 7 June 1981.
15. Al-Ahram, p. 4, 10 October 1981.
16. Al-Ahram, p. 10, 8 March 1982.
17. New York Times, p. 5, 23 October 1981.
18. Al-Ahram, p. 3, 15 March 1982.
19. Al-Majalla, p. 12, 3 November 1984.
20. Al-Ahram, p. 7, 20 December 1981.

21. FBIS-MEA, "Sadat's Speech in Alexandria," p. D1, 14 September 1981.
22. FBIS-MEA, "Ali Delivers Foreign Policy Lecture," p. D2, 12 October 1982.
23. Al-Mustaobal, pp. 34-35, 14 May 1982.
24. FBIS-MEA, "NDP's Official Speech," p. D5, 30 September 1981.
25. An-Nahar Al-Arabi Wa Adduwali, p. 26, 20 March - 4 April 1982.
26. American-Arab Affairs Council, Special Report No. 3, "Interview with President Mubarak," September 1982.
27. Al-Ahali, p. 2, 19 June 1982.
28. Al-Ahram, p. 7, 1 July 1982.
29. Al-Akhbar, p. 6, 29 June 1982.
30. Al-Gomhouriyah, 5 July 1982.
31. Al-Ahram, 4 July 1982.
32. Al-Sha'b, pp. 15-16, 29 June 1982.
33. Akhbar Al-Yawm, p. 8, 3 July 1982.
34. Mayo, p. 1, 5 July 1982.
35. Al-Ahram, pp. 1-3, 6 September 1982.
36. Al-Akhbar, 3 September 1982.
37. Al-Ahram, p. 4, 12 November 1982.
38. Monday Morning, p. 52, 6-12 December 1982.
39. Al-Majalla, pp. 5-8, 18-24 December 1982.
40. Rose El-Youssef, p. 21, 19 September 1983.
41. Al-Majalla, p. 21, 18-24 December 1983.
42. FBIS-MEA, "Mubarak Council on Foreign Relations Speech," p. D1, 2, 30 September 1983.
43. Al-Ahram, p. 7, 31 March 1984.

CHAPTER V. POLITICO-DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE
SOVIET UNION AND THE NONALIGNED MOVEMENT

1. FBIS-MEA, "Cabinet Expels Soviet Diplomats," pp. D25-27, 16 September 1981.
2. New York Times, p. A8, 20 October 1981.
3. "Interview with President Mubarak," October, 1 November 1981.
4. Al-Mussawar, 21 January 1982.
5. FBIS-MEA, "Ali to Reassure U.S. on Soviet Ties," p. D1, 27 January 1982.
6. Al-Ahram, 29 January 1982.
7. FBIS-MEA, "Mubarak Details Discussion from Recent Tour," p. D1, 10 February 1982.
8. Al-Akhbar, p. 1, 7 February 1982.
9. Akhbar Al-Yawm, p. 8, 6 February 1982.
10. FBIS-MEA, "UN Envoy Denounces USSR Statement on Sinai," p. D8, 10 May 1982.
11. FBIS-MEA, "Spokesman Reacts to USSR Government Statement," pp. 5-6, 13 October 1981.
12. FBIS-MEA, "Ghali Discusses Mideast Peace, Soviet Role," p. D1, 22 February 1982.
13. Al-Ahram, p. 7, 19 July 1982.
14. FBIS-MEA, "Mubarak Discusses Relations with Israel, USSR," p. D2, 19 November 1982.
15. FBIS-MEA, "USSR's Baybakov Stops over at Cairo Airport," p. D1, 3 March 1983.
16. Asharq Al-Awsat, p. 3, 22 October 1983.
17. Akhbar Al-Yawm, p. 1, 4 June 1983.
18. Al-Majalla, p. 13, 12-18 February 1983.
19. Al-Majalla, p. 12, 9-15 April 1983.
20. Asharq Al-Awsat, p. 3, 23 January 1983.

21. Al-Mussawar, 27 March 1983; and Al-Hawadess, 1 April 1983.
22. Akhbar Al-Yawm, p. 1, 20 August 1983.
23. Al-Ahali, p. 2, 24 August 1983.
24. FBIS-MEA, "Soviet Official Arrives Ahead of Schedule," p. D1, 19 September 1983.
25. Akhbar Al-Yawm, pp. 1, 8, 1 October 1983.
26. FBIS-MEA, "Mubarak Interviewed on Local, World Issues," p. D4, 20 October 1983.
27. Jordan Times, p. 5, 24 March 1984.
28. FBIS-MEA, "Foreign Ministry Official, USSR's Polyakov Meet," p. D1, 18 April 1984.
29. Al-Ra'y, pp. 1, 5, 7 April 1984.
30. FBIS-MEA, "Diplomatic Relations to be Resumed with USSR," p. D1, 30 April 1984.
31. FBIS-MEA, "Ghali on Exchange of Envoys with Moscow," p. D1, 1 June 1984.
32. Al-Siyasah, p. 18, 31 July 1984.
33. Asharq Al-Awsat, p. 1, 9 July 1984.
34. Al-Gomhouriya, p. 5, 16 July 1984.
35. Asharq Al-Awsat, p. 8, 9 August 1984.
36. Al-Sha'b, p. 12, 21 August 1984.
37. Asharq Al-Awsat, p. 3, 16 September 1984.
38. FBIS-MEA, "Spokesman Denies Statements by Ambassador in USSR," p. D1, 20 September 1984.
39. Al-Majalla, p. 29, 17-23 December 1983.
40. Asharq Al-Awsat, p. 1, 4 November 1984.
41. An-Nahar Al-Arabi Wa Ad-Duwali, p. 19, 13-19 June 1983.
42. Ahmed, A. Y., "Continuity and Change in Mubarak's Foreign Policy," Al-Siyasah Al-Duwaliyah, v. 18, pp. 105-132, July 1982.

43. Mayo, p. 5, 9 November 1981.
44. Al-Ahram, p. 7, 27 April 1982.
45. FBIS-MEA, "Mubarak's 26 January Speech," p. D4, 28 January 1982.
46. Nafi', I., Winds of Democracy, pp. 123,124, Cairo, 1984.
47. Mayo, p. 3, 2 August 1982.
48. Al-Mussawar, p. 16, 11 November 1983.
49. Al-Ahram, pp. 1, 4, 23 April 1982.
50. Al-Akhbar, p. 3, 1 March 1982.
51. FBIS-MEA, "Mubarak Speech to UN General Assembly," pp. D1-4, 29 September 1983.
52. Asharq Al-Awsat, p. 3, 5 March 1983.
53. Akhbar Al-Yawm, p. 3, 6 August 1983.
54. Al-Ahram, p. 4, 13 July 1984.
55. Ibrahim, S. E., "Egyptian Policy in the 80s, from Abdel Nasser to Sadat to Mubarak," Al-Ahram Al-Iqtisadi, pp. 28-30, 14 February 1983.
56. Akhbar Al-Yawm, p. 15, 28 April 1984.
57. Akhbar Al-Yawm, pp. 1, 8, 18 August 1984; Mayo, p. 9, 27 August 1984.
58. Ar-Ra'y Al-Yawm, p. 16, 5 September 1982.
59. Al-Akhbar, p. 1, 4, 9 December 1983.
60. FBIS-MEA, "Safwat Ash-Sharif on Meeting," p. D1, 18 January 1984.
61. Al-Ahali, p. 3, 18 August 1982.

CHAPTER VI. MILITARY RELATIONS

1. "Interview with Kamal Hassan Ali," Al-Mussawar, p. 25, 25 March 1983.
2. Al-Ahram, p. 1, 3 November 1984; and Asharq Al-Awsat, p. 1, 28 October 1984.
3. World Armaments and Disarmaments: SIPRI Yearbook 1984, Taylor & Francis, 1984.
4. Akhbar Al-Yawm, pp. 3, 15, 29 December 1979.
5. Mayo, 18 January 1982.
6. Al-Ahram, p. 1, 1 February 1982.
7. Asharq Al-Awsat, p. 8, 11 November 1984.
8. Al-Ahram Al-Iqtisadi, pp. 20, 21, 3 December 1984.
9. Asharq Al-Awsat, p. 3, 10 November 1984.
10. Asharq Al-Awsat, p. 3, 16 August 1984.
11. Asharq Al-Awsat, p. 3, 28 July 1984.
12. Al-Ahram, p. 3, 9 August 1981; p. 1, 22 January 1980.
13. Al-Siyasi, pp. 3, 11, 24 April 1983.
14. "Interview with Abu-Ghazalah," Asharq Al-Awsat, p. 3, 6 March 1983.
15. Al-Ahram, p. 6, 2 November 1981.
16. Al-Ahram, p. 1, 17 August 1981.
17. Al-Ahram, p. 1, 19 August 1981.
18. Al-Ahram, p. 1, 22 January 1980.
19. Mayo, 24 August 1981.
20. Asharq Al-Awsat, p. 3, 11 August 1981.
21. FBIS-MEA, "Butrus Ghali Interviewed in Paris," p. D5, 16 August 1983.
22. Akher Sa'a, pp. 10, 11, 13 June 1984; Al-Ahram, p. 3, 15 June 1984.

23. Mayo, p. 3, 2 August 1982.
24. Rose El-Youssef, pp. 20, 21, 18 June 1984.
25. FBIS-MEA, "Abu-Ghazalah Discusses Military Strategy," p. D1, 2 October 1981.
26. Al-Majalla, p. 14, 7-13 May 1983.
27. Al-Majalla, pp. 18-20, 20-26 August 1983.
28. FBIS-MEA, "Mubarak on Bright Star Exercise," p: D1, 12 November 1981.
29. FBIS-MEA, "Mubarak," p. D4, 7 December 1981.
30. Akhbar Al-Yawm, 6 August 1984.
31. El-Shazli, S., The Crossing of the Suez, American Mid-east Research, 1980.
32. FBIS-MEA, "Abu-Ghazalah on Future U.S.-Egyptian Exercises," p. D2, 30 November 1981.
33. Asharq Al-Awsat, p. 2, 23 August 1984.
34. Al-Sha'b, p. 11, 9 August 1983.
35. Al-Ahali, p. 2, 10 August 1983.
36. Al-Sha'b, p. 1, 19, 16 August 1983.
37. Al-Ahali, p. 5, 31 August 1983.
38. Asharq Al-Awsat, p. 11, 11 November 1984.
39. Al-Ahram, 1 May 1984.

CHAPTER VII. ECONOMIC AND TRADE RELATIONS

1. Al-Ahram Al-Igtisadi, pp. 13-15, 29 March 1982.
2. "Special Report: Egypt," Middle East Economic Digest (MEED), p. 4, August 1984.
3. Al-Ahram Al-Igtisadi, pp. 72-77, 19 November 1984.
4. Aliboni, R., and others, Egypt's Economic Potential, Croom Helm, 1984.

5. Al-Ahram Al-Igtisadi, pp. 28-31, 30 May 1983.
6. Al-Mussawar, pp. 18-21, 10 August 1984.
7. Rose El-Youssef, 24 September 1979; 26 May 1980.
8. Al-Ahram Al-Igtisadi, pp. 52-54, 5 November 1984.
9. Al-Ahram Al-Igtisadi, pp. 30, 31, 22 October 1984.
10. MEED, p. 10, 10 August 1984.
11. Asharg Al-Awsat, p. 1, 2 October 1984.
12. Al-Ahram Al-Igtisadi, pp. 24, 25, 20 September 1982; and Asharg Al-Awsat, p. 4, 11 November 1984.
13. Al-Ahram Al-Igtisadi, pp. 12-14, 5 September 1983; and Al-Ahram, p. 9, 14 November 1982.
14. Asharg Al-Awsat, p. 5, 6 October 1984.
15. International Monetary Fund, Direction of Trade Statistics Year Book, 1984.
16. Asharg Al-Awsat, p. 1, 30 December 1981.
17. Asharg Al-Awsat, p. 3, 11 August 1983.
18. Al-Ahram Al-Igtisadi, pp. 6-8, 3 October 1983.
19. Al-Majalla, p. 3, 17-23 November 1984.
20. Al-Ahram Al-Igtisadi, p. 6, 16 May 1983.
21. MEED, p. 12, 11 May 1984.
22. Al-Ahram, p. 8, 17 July 1984.
23. MEED, p. 18, 23 December 1984.
24. MEED, p. 13, 6 January 1984.
25. Al-Majalla, p. 11, 16-22 October 1982.
26. Al-Ahram Al-Igtisadi, p. 5, 29 October 1984.
27. Marches Tropicaux et Mediterraneens, p. 393, 18 February 1983.
28. FBIS-MEA, "Trade with Hungary," p. D7, 17 February 1982.

29. MEED, p. 9, 9 December 1983.
30. MEED, p. 22, 2 March 1984.
31. Al-Ahram, p. 8, 6 April 1982.
32. MEED, p. 10, 3 February 1984.
33. FBIS-MEA, "Government Trade Center to Reopen in Sofia," p. D1, 12 September 1984.
34. Waterbury, J., The Egypt of Nasser and Sadat: The Political Economy of Two Regimes, p. 405, Princeton University Press, 1983.
35. Abdel-Qadus, I., October, p. 15, 5 September 1982; and Al-Ahram Al-Igtisadi, pp. 22-25, 7 March 1983.
36. Al-Mussawar, pp. 18-21, 10 August 1984.

CHAPTER VIII. CONCLUSION

1. "Interview with Marshal Abu-Ghazalah," Al-Akhbar, pp. 3, 4, 1 October 1983.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

	No. Copies
1. Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	2
2. Library, Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943	2
3. Department Chairman, Code 56 Department of National Security Affairs Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943	1
4. Center for Naval Analyses 2000 North Beauregard Street P.O. Box 11280 Alexandria, Virginia 22311	1
5. John W. Amos, Code 56Am Department of National Security Affairs Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943	1
6. Ralph H. Magnus, Code 56Mg Department of National Security Affairs Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943	1
7. Director Defense Intelligence Agency ATTN: Robert Vitrikas/DB3C3 Bolling AFB Washington, D.C. 20332	1
8. Director Defense Intelligence Agency ATTN: David J. Goldman/DE4 Bolling AFB Washington, D.C. 20332	1
9. Michael J. Wagner PSC Box 486 APO New York 09254	1

11. LTC Greg H. Bradford, USAF 1
 Department of State
 Office of Inter-African Affairs
 Washington, D.C. 20520
12. Major Walter L. Worley, III 1
 599A Michelson Road
 Monterey, California 93940
13. Mr. Youssef A. Amer 10
 1218 Golden Trophy Drive
 Dallas, Texas 75232
14. Librarian 1
 American University, Cairo
 P.O. Box 2511, Cairo
 Egypt
15. American Embassy 1
 United States Defense Attache Office, Cairo
 Box 9
 FPO New York 09527
16. Deputy Chief of Naval Operations 1
 Plans and Policy, OP-603
 Department of the Navy
 Washington, D.C. 20350
17. Deputy Chief of Naval Operations 1
 Plans and Policy, OP-611
 Department of the Navy
 Washington, D.C. 20350
18. Deputy Chief of Naval Operations 1
 Office of Naval Intelligence, OP-009F
 Department of the Navy
 Washington, D.C. 20350

~~8~~


21 1071

Thesis
A42962 Amer
c.1

Egypt between the su-
perpowers: continuity
or change in Egyptian
foreign policy under
Mubarak.

thesA42962

Egypt between the superpowers :



3 2768 000 98629 3

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY